REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1. REPORT DATE *(DD-MM-YYYY)*	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED *(From - To)*
xx-10-2004	Technical	Oct 2004

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
SOF Language Transformation Strategy Needs Assessment Project	H92239-04-P-0085

SOFLO Focus Group Data Analysis
Technical Report

5b. GRANT NUMBER

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)	5d. PROJECT NUMBER
SWA Consulting Inc.	

5e. TASK NUMBER

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
SWA Consulting Inc. 311 S. Harrington St. Suite 200 Raleigh, NC 27603	20040501

9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
Special Operations Forces Language Office HQ, US Army Special Operations Command BLDG E-2929 Desert Storm Drive Fort Bragg, NC 28310	SOFLO

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

   A. Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT
The SOF Language Transformation Strategy Needs Assessment Project, sponsored by SOFLO, was designed to collect data from operators, command language program managers, unit commanders, and trainers related to current language usage and training, to issues that impact usage and training, and to solutions for improving language capabilities and training. Twenty-one focus groups were conducted to evaluate the current state of foreign language usage and training across the SOF community. Focus groups were organized in three broad sections in which participants were asked to: (1) describe ways in which they used foreign languages on the job, (2) describe their previous language training experiences and indicate ways in which such training could be improved, and (3) break into teams and to prepare and present a "decision brief" on language issues and solutions for their unit commander. Key findings included that language proficiency is critical to mission effectiveness in some situations and a benefit in almost all situations discussed. In addition, SOF personnel reported that speaking and conversational listening were their primary language skills, and SOF operators considered it important to have conversational language proficiency in order to build rapport. Finally, the diversity of missions and areas of operation within the SOF community presents challenges for language training and sustainment.

15. SUBJECT TERMS
SOF, Language strategy, Needs assessment, Focus groups

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
			UU (SAR)		Surface, Eric A.
a. REPORT U	b. ABSTRACT U	c. THIS PAGE U		293	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER *(include area code)* 919-480-2751

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18

SOF Language Transformation Strategy Needs Assessment Project: SOFLO Focus Group Data Analysis Technical Report

Executive Summary

SOF Language Transformation Strategy Needs Assessment Project

To help ensure that Special Operations Forces (SOF) operators have sufficient second language proficiency to accomplish their diverse missions, a comprehensive language strategy is needed to guide the allocation of resources to provide initial acquisition, sustainment, and enhancement training as well as tools and other resources across all SOF components (e.g., Army Special Forces, Army Civil Affairs, Navy SEALs, etc.). In order to develop an effective SOF language strategy, data about the current state of language usage, proficiency, and training are required as well as projections of future mission requirements and training needs, thus, allowing for *gap analysis* (i.e., the difference between the desired state and the current state) to inform strategic planning and resource allocation. The SOF Language Transformation Strategy Needs Assessment Project, sponsored by the Special Operations Forces Language Office (SOFLO), was designed to collect data from operators, command language program managers, unit commanders, and trainers related to current language usage and training, to issues that impact usage and training, and to solutions for improving language capabilities and training. The first phase of this project was conducted by SOFLO with the assistance and guidance of psychologists associated with the Army Research Institute (ARI) and the Consortium Research Fellows Program (CRFP). Data from SOF operators were collected using a series of focus groups across the entire SOF community (e.g., Army, Navy, and Air Force for both active and reserve components as appropriate). This document presents the results of this focus group study. Future phases are planned to collect data from the other groups. SOFLO will use this and other data to develop a comprehensive language strategy for SOF.

SOFLO Focus Group Project

Twenty-one focus groups lasting approximately three hours each were conducted in order to evaluate the current state of foreign language usage and training across the SOF community. These groups were conducted by psychologists provided by ARI through the CRFP and by SOFLO personnel. The units were tasked to provide participants and facilities for the focus groups. Focus groups were organized in three broad sections or question blocks. In the first block, participants were asked to describe ways in which they used foreign languages on the job. In the second, participants were asked to describe their previous language training experiences and indicate ways in which such training could be improved. In the third block, participants were asked break into teams and to prepare and present a "decision brief" on language issues and solutions for their unit commander. Topics to be addressed in the presentation included how much training should be required for their SOF type, when in the training pipeline language training should occur, what types of training should be utilized, and how could SOF better motivate persons to acquire and maintain language proficiency. Appendix A contains the focus group script for the project. A focus group workshop was conducted prior to the start of the project to train all project personnel on the focus group protocols.

Focus Group Results

Block 1 Results

Results from the first question block indicated significant diversity based on SOF type and the particular unit's job assignments. Some groups reported engaging primarily in training of military personnel in other countries. For these groups, special emphasis was placed on knowledge of both colloquial language used by foreign military troops, and more formal language needed to converse with ranking officers in the foreign military. Also, the need for more technical military vocabulary was desirable for these persons. Importantly, not having sufficient language proficiency can limit the effectiveness of the training and can create safety issues. For example, running a live-fire range with foreign personnel and not speaking the language or having a good interpreter could be a potentially dangerous situation according to some focus group participants.

Others reported engaging in downrange missions in which they primarily interacted with local, non-military, persons. For these groups emphasis was placed on language as it is used by non-military personnel. These groups indicated a specific need for knowledge of local dialects as well as an understanding of the culture of the location to which they were deployed. Several comments indicated that immersion training was particularly well suited for acquiring the highly important cultural information for these groups. These groups also indicated that often more advanced proficiency was needed especially as reliable, trustworthy local interpreters could be hard to come by in some locations (e.g., Iraq).

Both groups described above seemed to fully appreciate the advantages of language proficiency. Many comments were directed at the favorable impression that proficiency has on foreign speakers. There were many comments indicating the benefits of better rapport with locals created by using the local language at even the most basic level and by understanding the culture. Many participants indicated that their missions would not have been as effective and might have failed in some cases without the rapport they developed through their speaking skills and knowledge of the culture. In other cases, language proficiency was reported as being beneficial to getting things done in a timely manner or in "living off the economy" effectively. Additionally, many comments also indicated that a lack of proficiency could be both detrimental to the mission and could potentially cause risk of serious injury to SOF personnel. For example, some units noted that the word "bomb" was sometimes written in Arabic on roadsides in Iraq in order to warn locals of danger. Others indicated that being able to understand that a crowd was chanting "Bring back Saddam" was instrumental to understanding that the situation was potentially dangerous. Some participants indicated that language proficiency was an excellent tool for information gathering in public places (e.g., market or café) leading to enhanced force protection and to potentially actionable intelligence.

The use of language to build rapport, to train foreign personnel, to interact with local officials and civilians, to ensure force protection, and to function in other nations (e.g., "living off the economy") was reported as important by SOF personnel. Even in the context of direct action missions or potentially confrontational situations (e.g., boarding a boat or crowd control), SOF personnel reported knowing basic commands (e.g., "Halt," "Drop Your Weapon," or "Stay Back") was important. Often times, the lack of language proficiency was viewed as nuisance because it created logistical issues or increased the amount of time basic activities required. For example, one Navy unit reported that moving boats at a dock—an activity that should have taken a couple of hours—required an entire day because of the language barrier. Although SOF personnel indicted that having increased language proficiency would be preferable and would increase their effectiveness, they reported frequently "working around" the lack of proficiency by using hand gestures or demonstration to accomplish their mission.

Block 2 Results

In the second question block, answers tended to be quite diverse as different SOF units had many different training experiences. For all types and units, immersion training was uniformly perceived as being most beneficial. Almost all comments recommended some type of immersion training following some initial classroom instruction. Methods of language maintenance training tended to vary as well, though resources such as language labs were seen as advantageous. Many groups indicated conflicts with other job tasks as being a barrier to language maintenance, and most suggested some type of annual immersion training as a form of refresher training.

Many groups talked in detail about their experiences with particular training programs. Given the diversity of training experience though, these comments do not summarize well across SOF types and no comprehensive evaluative statement can be made. However, most SOF personnel indicated a preference for training specific to their situation and needs. Also of note, during the interview sessions, groups were typically explicitly asked about the potential of distributed learning (DL) and technology delivered training (TDT). In general, enthusiasm regarding these techniques was not strong. While few comments with respect to these techniques were negative, groups rarely mentioned them unless prompted. Also, several comments implied skepticism that these techniques could be effective for initial language acquisition. Instead, comments generally indicated that these techniques may (or may not) be useful for language maintenance. Of note, reserve units seemed to view DL and TDT as more favorable than did active units. Some reservists indicated that their distance from the reserve center would prohibit them from participating in non-drill-weekend language training or in using language lab resources.

A common theme involved the assessment of language proficiency. Many comments were negatively directed at the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT), which assesses reading and listening skills. Across all SOF types,

speaking and listening proficiencies were by far reported as the most important. Most SOF units stated that they spend most of their time using foreign languages when conversing directly with others. However, many groups complained that the DLPT does not assess speaking or even listening skills that are similar to situations in which SOF personnel are likely to be. For example, the DLPT was perceived as being a measure of more academic language skills than is often encountered with poorly educated populations with which SOF units typically deal. Current perceptions of the DLPT are unfavorable which seemed to lead to perceptions of unfairness in Foreign Language Proficiency Pay (FLPP). Although most SOF personnel indicated speaking was the primary skill modality they used, very few personnel had ever taken an Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI), which is designed to assess speaking proficiency. Some participants reported issues with personnel who were sent as interpreters because of their high DLPT scores but who could not speak the language. This would suggest a basic misunderstanding by some leaders and personnel administrators about the nature of language skills. If a person is able to score well on listening and reading tested by the DLPT, this does not necessarily mean that person can speak the language, more or less serve as an interpreter.

While not commonly encountered, one important issue was some unit commanders emphasizing taking the DLPT in order to report a high unit participation rate. This sounds like a positive finding at first glance. However, these personnel also reported going to the testing center and not really taking the test (i.e., handing the test back in after 5 minutes or just marking responses at random) because the unit commanders were not really concerned about their proficiency, just them taking the test. Additionally, participant perceptions that the minimum proficiency level for receiving FLPP is beyond the reach of many SOF personnel may contribute to not taking the testing process seriously. The poor view of the DLPT, the lack of training opportunities and operating outside their AO (e.g., a Spanish speaker in Iraq) may contribute as well.

Although immersion techniques are highly popular and thought to be extremely effective, some groups realized that they are not always feasible due to time and other resource constraints. Many groups suggested interesting alternative ways to enhance language skills while minimizing time and financial constraints. One common suggestion was a stateside 'immersion' training in which a group, along with a facilitator, would spend time in a US location speaking only a foreign language. Other suggestions included having dedicated days or times for which only a foreign language would be spoken (e.g., while the unit went about its core job tasks). Generally speaking, these types of suggestions were better received than technology oriented solutions such as DL or TDT. When asked about integrating language training into existing training for other SOF skills or training exercises, participants usually thought it was a good idea when all the personnel spoke the same language or it was part of pre-deployment training for a specific operation which was provided to members of the unit. However, this is often not the case and, therefore, less practical. For example, on some Special Forces teams, there may be speakers of 3 to 5 different languages, preventing the teams from conducting non-language training exercises in any other language but English. One exception is the 7th Special Forces Group where Spanish is the primary language because of their orientation to South America.

During the second question block several comments were made that highlighted special issues in language training faced by reserve/National Guard units. Key issues identified were a lack of ability to engage in prolonged language training after initial general training was complete, a lack of resources available to maintain proficiency, some resentment over low levels of FLPP (i.e., low dollar amounts for reservists), the complexity of filing the paperwork to receive FLPP, not receiving FLPP even when qualified, and a low priority placed on language training by unit leadership. Though discussed in more detail elsewhere, constraints on language acquisition and maintenance for reservists were significant. In general, reserve units desired more opportunities for additional training or maintenance and, as a result, they tended to show more enthusiasm about technological solutions such as DL and TDT. Some participating reservists indicated they would be motivated to study language on their own at home if the resources where available.

Block 3 Results

In the third block (group presentations), groups indicated that training should focus on speaking and listening skills. Recommendations with regards to where in the pipeline classroom training should occur varied by SOF type. Some groups indicated that language training should occur right away in the pipeline. Others recommended that it occur later in the pipeline and be immediately following by immersion training. Some Army Special Forces (SF) units indicated that burnout was typically a problem near the end of the pipeline and that language training should occur

after being sent to the unit for a period of time. For all SOF types, reservists indicated that language training should occur as part of the initial training given limited opportunities for long periods after the initial training sequence. Most groups indicated that at least basic proficiency should be mandatory for everyone. Some groups indicated that advanced proficiency should be optional and based on interest and ability.

Levels of proficiency required also varied by unit. Almost all groups reported using interpreters, at least on occasion. Several groups with lower proficiency levels reported relying heavily on interpreters. There were many comments identifying issues in selecting an interpreter. Many groups reported that interpreters often are not trustworthy and often have their own agendas. These issues seemed to occur particularly frequently for those units working in the Middle-East. Many participants indicated that even with an interpreter, a level of language proficiency is needed to ensure the interpreter is translating correctly and is trustworthy. Many participants indicated having serious issues with interpreters ranging from poor proficiency to intentional mistranslation to promote another agenda.

Several barriers to language acquisition and maintenance were identified, though they varied somewhat by active/reserve status and, to a lesser extent, SOF type. While several comments indicated that there were financial constraints, many more indicated that time or job duty constraints were a bigger problem, specifically for immersion or extended classroom program (e.g., Defense Language Institute, DLI). Some groups indicated that DLI programs were too extensive for their needs. Time constraints were especially problematic for reservists. Given the limited amount of time available, reservists reported a low priority for language proficiency skills among command leadership. Some reservists indicated that acquiring and maintaining language proficiency requires the same amount of time whether you are on active duty or in the reserves and, therefore, they should receive the same FLPP as active duty personnel.

Some groups suggested changing the current compensation system (e.g., allowing FLPP for an unlimited number of languages, increasing rewards based on length of maintenance; increasing the amount of FLPP) to better promote motivation to acquire language skills. One common suggestion was to begin some FLPP for low levels of proficiency. Comments by many participants suggest that FLPP is not an incentive to maintaining or enhancing their language skills because it is unattainable given the current context (e.g., operation tempo, command emphasis on language training, etc.) and proficiency requirements for FLPP. Others suggested offering immersion training as a reward for maintaining language skills. Finally, other comments indicated a need for better pay for proficiency for difficult languages. For languages such as Arabic, a proficiency level of 1-1 may be more difficult to obtain than advanced proficiency for more simplistic languages.

Many of the results from the third block are idiosyncratic to SOF-type, mission or unit and do not summarize well. For more specific results, the reader is directed to the sections related to the specific SOF components.

Summary of Major Findings across SOF Units

Major findings from the focus groups across SOF types were as follows:
- Language proficiency is critical to mission effectiveness in some situations and a benefit in almost all situations discussed.
- Most SOF personnel reported speaking and conversational listening were their primary language skills.
- Having enough conversational language proficiency to build rapport was reported as important by SOF operators.
- The diversity of missions and areas of operation within the SOF community presents challenges for language training and sustainment. Even within Special Forces, there are distinct differences in language usage and requirements across the various Groups. This makes a one-size-fits-all solution problematic.
- A general lack of time to dedicate to language acquisition and maintenance was reported because of operations tempo and training for other SOF skills.
- Language learning tools or training options are not always available to personnel or flexible enough to accommodate their schedules when they have time to train. The availability of tools and training options is not uniform across SOF.
- Unit commanders do not necessarily place emphasis on and provide support for language training.

- Perceptions that the DLPT was not a valid assessment of language ability as it is used by SOF personnel
- Frustration with the substantial proficiency requirements needed to receive FLPP was reported.
- Issues in dealing with interpreters were reported frequently.
- DL and TDT were not well received by most active duty personnel in the study.
- Several issues with reserve units including:
  - Time constraints make language training difficult for reservists.
  - The FLPP system is not having the desired impact for reservists.
  - A lack of resources to obtain and maintain language proficiency is the rule, not the exception.
  - A lack of pre-deployment language training for many reservists leaves them unprepared while on active duty.
  - Poor command support for language skills in general hinders efforts to improve individual and unit proficiency.

The findings present above are a summary sample pulled from the report. Because of the variability in missions and AOs across the SOF community, general findings that apply equally for all SOF types (e.g., Special Forces) are limited. Although readers are encouraged to review the overall results, they should review the results by SOF types for findings specific to each group. These specific findings should be used to inform strategy development and decision making for each group. Additionally, findings are presented by active and reserve status.

Recommendations

Several recommendations can be made to increase the effectiveness of language training and proficiency within the SOF. Among these:

- Focus SOF related training and testing on speaking and conversational listening skills to the extent possible. However, to learn a language effectively, the other skill modalities are needed as well.
- Pay FLPP for speaking proficiency as measured by an Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) or other speaking assessment. Paying personnel for the skills they actually use on the job makes sense from a mission effectiveness standpoint, compensation standpoint, and an individual motivational standpoint.
- Lower the required level of proficiency needed to receive some FLPP, particularly for difficult languages. Currently, a 2-2 proficiency in Arabic is not tenable for many SOF units and surpasses their needed proficiency levels given their job duties. Receiving FLPP at lower levels would at least encourage some basic proficiency in a language and provide a realistic incentive to improve language proficiency to higher levels. As many comments indicate, even basic proficiency can have many desirable outcomes. Also, having even minimal proficiency could greatly help in selecting a local interpreter for many units. Based on the comments of study participants, paying FLPP for 1+, 1+ or 1+ would provide a more realistic, motivating first step in the ladder to achieve higher proficiency.
- Create a new SOF specific test of language proficiency that assesses conversational skills of both military specific language and colloquial language. Though such a test would be difficult to standardize, it would seem to be a more valid measure of language skills as they are used by SOF units. This could be accomplished with a modified DLI OPI.
- Create SOF-type specific training programs where feasible and where they do not exist. Even if these were run through DLI, the types of language skills needed by SOF units differ considerably from those currently taught at DLI. SOF-type specific programs would allow more rapid curriculum changes to reflect likely locations in which trainees would eventually work. Regional or local dialects could be covered as well as some basic information regarding the culture of the location.
- Given the diversity of training being conducted in the SOF community, no conclusions could be drawn about training effectiveness from the focus group data. A comprehensive, standardized study and multiple customized studies of training effectiveness in the SOF community would help leaders to determine which training options provide the greatest benefit for SOF units and personnel. The same should be required of DLI training.
- Provide job aids and special enhancement training courses or tools that address military and technical language related to the missions.

- Consider alternative training strategies such as designating days/time in which only foreign languages will be spoken. Such activities consume very few resources yet could greatly reinforce language maintenance.
- Based on some comments that raised questions about the DLPT testing process, DLI should review their testing protocols. Additionally, DLI should be encouraged to provide a full accounting of the reliability and validity of the DLPT and OPI as required by the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, 1999) of all test providers.
- Raise compensation (i.e., FLPP) for reserve units. Reservists should receive full FLPP. Given the difficulty in accessing resources to maintain language proficiency and the extremely low compensation that reserve units receive for maintaining proficiency, most reserve units have low motivation to acquire and maintain language proficiency.
- Utilize Mobile Training Detachments (MTD) to provide training "on the fly" to units that do not have an established language training program, especially reserve units.
- Educate unit commanders and staff officers, command language program managers, and SOF personnel about the language learning tools and training options available for their use and about funding options for other programs.
- Provide more training options for reserve units such as paying for tuition for local college language courses and investing in DL and TDT programs for reservists.
- Include all language training during initial training cycle (e.g., MOS training or AIT for their SOF type) for reserve units where appropriate. Time constraints make training for these units difficult one the initial period is over.
- Provide pre-deployment language and culture training for activated reserve units and active duty units working outside their primary AO. This training should be customized to the mission.

Questions and Comments

Any technical questions about the data analysis should be directed to Dr. Adam Meade. Questions about the focus group study or Surface, Ward & Associates should be directed to Dr. Eric A. Surface. Dr. Meade can be reached via email at adam_meade@ncsu.edu and via phone at 919.513.4857. Dr. Surface can be reached via email at esurface@bellsouth.net or eric.a.surface@us.army.mil and via phone at 919.821.7221. Other questions about SOF language should be directed to LTC Jack Donnelly, chief, Special Operations Forces Language Office.

Table of Contents

Table of Figures and Tables

SOFLO Focus Group Data Analysis Technical Report

Project Overview

To help ensure that Special Operations Forces (SOF) operators have sufficient second language proficiency to accomplish their diverse missions, a comprehensive language strategy is needed to guide the allocation of resources to provide initial acquisition, sustainment, and enhancement training as well as tools and other resources across all SOF components (e.g., Army Special Forces, Army Civil Affairs, Navy SEALs, etc.). In order to develop an effective SOF language strategy, data about the current state of language usage, proficiency, and training are required as well as projections of future mission requirements and training needs, thus, allowing for *gap analysis* (i.e., the difference between the desired state and the current state) to inform strategic planning and resource allocation. The SOF Language Transformation Strategy Needs Assessment Project, sponsored by the Special Operations Forces Language Office (SOFLO), was designed to collect data from operators, command language program managers, unit commanders, and trainers related to current language usage and training, to issues that impact usage and training, and to solutions for improving language capabilities and training. The first phase of this project was conducted by SOFLO with the assistance and guidance of psychologists associated with the Army Research Institute (ARI) and the Consortium Research Fellows Program (CRFP). Data from SOF operators were collected using a series of focus groups across the entire SOF community (e.g., Army, Navy, and Air Force for both active and reserve components as appropriate). This document presents the results of this focus group study. Future phases are planned to collect data from the other groups. SOFLO will use this and other data to develop a comprehensive language strategy for SOF.

Navigating this Report

This report in organized such that the reader may quickly access information relevant to his or her specific needs. Below, the general approach, method, and analyses conducted are described in detail. Results for frequency analyses of the focus group content are first presented for all twenty-one focus groups in the Overall Results section of the report. It is in this section that prominent issues common across all SOF types are first identified and discussed in detail. Following the overall analyses summary, frequency data are presented by active v. reserve / National Guard units. In these sections, differences between these groups are highlighted and results are reported primarily as they relate to the overall summary findings. As such, it is recommended that the reader first read the overall summary findings before reading information relating the specific SOF types.

Following active/reserve presentation of results, summaries are provided by each SOF type. These analyses present the most common issues identified by each type. Frequency analyses of the number of times a comment was mentioned are presented as are brief narrative summaries for each focus group conducted, organized by SOF type. Both the frequencies and narrative comments were used to provide a brief overview summary of key issues for each SOF type.

Finally, a summary of recommendations is provided given the issues identified by the focus groups.

Statement of Approach

Having a strategy and linking operations to that strategy is critical for the success of any organization. A strategy can encompass different scopes—organization, unit, mission, task, process, or product/service. In the most basic terms, a strategy should specify the what (objectives, content), who (personnel, groups), where (locations), how (resources and activities), and when (time goal) at the level specified. The strategy should look both externally and internally for impetus, constraints, and opportunities. The strategy should guide all action with in its scope, including the allocation of resources. Research has shown that lack of strategic alignment is one of the reasons why many training programs fail to achieve the desired results (Tannenbaum, 2002).

In the case of SOF Language, external and internal forces are indicating the need for the re-development of the strategy. In this case, the gap between the current levels of language proficiency and the language capabilities needed for current & future mission success should be driving the strategy. The strategy must reflect the diverse nature of SOF components and their missions as well as constraints, such as, the career-lifecycle of each type of SOF and OPTEMPO. The strategy must specify how to development and maintain the required proficiency across SOF components and missions. Once a comprehensive strategy is developed, it should be used to guide the allocation of resources to training, maintaining, and supporting the language capabilities throughout the SOF community.

One of the first steps is to collect information about the current state of SOF language proficiency and training. The main goal of this study is to gather first-hand input from SOF personnel to inform the development of a SOF language strategy. This section outlines the rational and approach for using focus groups to collect this data.

Needs assessment techniques can be used for the identification and specification of problems or performance gaps in any number of situations (Swanson, 1994; Zemke, 1994). Organizations can utilize the results of the analysis to select the most viable solution or solutions to the problem, which may or may not include training. At the strategic level, needs assessment can be used to support the development of a strategy to address problems and opportunities. Multiple techniques can be used to accomplish needs assessment in most organizations—surveys, focus groups, interviews, records/policy reviews, and observations. Each technique has strengths and weaknesses. The best needs assessment strategy is to utilize multiple methods to gather data in order to gain a more complete picture of the situation (McClelland, 1994; Swanson, 1994). The realities of the project and organization as well as the data requirements should guide the selection of techniques. Research has shown that a needs assessment is often skipped by organizations because organizational representatives believe they "know" the problem and all its issues already. The failure to perform a thorough needs assessment/analysis has lead to many programs and initiatives not achieving their stated objectives. Additionally, a needs assessment can increase the acceptance and credibility of the program or strategy.

In the case of the SOF Language Transformation Strategy Project, three needs assessment techniques have been identified by SOFLO for use: (1) Review of organizational records, policy, and requirements; (2) Focus groups with SOF operators; and (3) surveys of Command Language Program Managers (CLPM), Unit Commanders, trainer/training developers, and SOF operators. This report deals with results of the focus group study. Before presenting the results, some information about the focus group technique might be helpful to the reader.

A focus group is a qualitative research method used to collect responses from a group of people familiar with a topic, service, experience, or product (Zemke & Kramlinger, 1982). A trained facilitator leads the participants through a pre-determined series of questions, discussions, or exercises. The facilitator may probe interesting responses further. Typically, focus groups are composed of 5 to 12 individuals who been selected for participation from a specified population based on a pre-established set of criteria. As with any research methodology, the use of random or stratified random sampling is preferred to convenience sampling. Unfortunately, in many organizational setting, it is not possible to ensure random or stratified random sampling.

For a focus group to be constructive, it must be moderated by an experienced professional (McClelland, 1994; Zemke, 1982). A trained facilitator leads the participants through a pre-determined script of questions, discussions, or exercises. The goal is to focus participant discussion skillfully to get information that addresses the objectives of the study. It is the facilitator's job to guide the discussion, encourage the participation of all group members, keep the discussion on track, and probe interesting responses further. The typical focus group runs 1 to 2 hours and should not exceed 4 hrs. Longer focus groups should have frequent breaks. Focus groups require much preparation by the facilitator and scribe.

To capture information effectively, thematic notes should be taken by a scribe. Additionally, the session should be recorded and transcribed for analysis. The thematic notes are important because the scribe can capture information that the transcript will not reveal. Importantly, the scribe's data are available immediately to adjust focus group protocol or questions. Plus, if the recording is unclear or destroyed there is a thematic and contextual record of the group. The analysis of the recording transcripts and the scribe notes should be done separately and then compared. Periodic in-process reviews ensure the process is capturing the desired information effectively. The process used in this study followed these general focus group principles and guidelines.

Sample Characteristics & Focus Group Overview

In order to better understand the language training needs of SOF units, 21 focus groups were conducted. In total 127 individuals participated in focus groups ranging in size from 3 to 11. Members of SOF units met for three hours to discuss their use of foreign languages in field settings, their previous training experiences with foreign languages, and ways to make the training process more applicable and useful to SOF units in the field. Basic summary statistics of military service appear below:

Table 1. Length of Service Statistics for Sample

	Average	Standard Deviation	Maximum	Minimum
Length of Military Service	13.6	7.0	1	35
Length of SOF Service	8.1	7.0	.5	32

Of these 21 focus groups, 14 were active duty SOF units and 7 were reserve duty units. Specifically, three units (one active duty and two reserve) represented Psychological Operations (Psy Op) SOF, eight (six active duty, two reserve) represented Army Special Forces (SF) units, two (both active duty) represented Air Force (AF) Special Operations, four (one active duty, three reserve) represented Civil Affair (CA) SOF, two (both active duty) represented Navy Sea, Air, & Land (SEAL) units, one (active duty) unit represented Navy Special Warfare Combatant-craft Crewman (SWCC), and one (active duty) represented Navy Special Operations. See Table 1 below for a summary.

Table 2. Focus Group Personnel Description

SOF Type	Unit	Active/ Reserve	# Participants	Average Military Service	Average SOF Service	Languages Spoken
Air Force SO	6th SOS	Active	4	15.5	4.3	Arabic
Air Force SO	6th SOS/ 25th ISO	Active	7	14.3	6.1	Mixed
Army SF	1st SFG	Active	6	11.5	5.0	Mixed Asian Languages
Army SF	3rd SFG(A)	Active	8	13.3	4.3	Primarily French
Army SF	5th SFG	Active	8	15.3	11.0	Primarily Arabic
Army SF	7th SFG	Active	8	13.4	8.1	Spanish
Army SF	10th SFG	Active	6	12.8	7.3	Mixed, Primarily Eastern European
Army SF	10th SFG*	Active	3	11.7	8.7	Mixed, Primarily Eastern European
Army SF	19th SFG(A)	Reserve	11	17.4	13.5	Mixed
Army SF	20th SFG(A)	Reserve	8	20.3	17.6	Mixed
Civil Affairs	96th CA	Active	5	15.4	12.4	Mixed, Primarily Spanish
Civil Affairs	425th CA	Reserve	9	5.1	2.6	Mixed
Civil Affairs**	364th CA	Reserve	8	21.1	6.4	Mixed
Civil Affairs**	364th CA	Reserve	7	12.0	6.8	Mixed
Psy. Operations	4th PO	Active	†	†	†	†
Psy. Operations	11th PO	Reserve	†	†	†	†
Psy. Operations	301st PO	Reserve	7	9.4	5.5	Mixed

SOF Type	Unit	Active/ Reserve	# Participants	Average Military Service	Average SOF Service	Languages Spoken
Navy SEALs	NSWG-1, ST5, NSWG-3, SBT12, NSWC	Active	5	11.6	7.7	Primarily Arabic
Navy SEALs		Active	†	†	†	†
Navy SWCC	SBT 22	Active	9	8.8	5.8	Spanish
Navy Special Ops.	NAVSCIATT	Active	7	15.7	11.1	Spanish

* two focus groups were conducted with this unit. ** demographic info for these two groups was reported such that it is not possible to determine which 364th unit was from Ft. Lewis and which was from Portland. † - information not available.

Audio recordings were made of each session and were subsequently transcribed. These transcriptions were then content analyzed. Due to technical difficulties, the recordings for two transcriptions were not available. However, notes made by session moderator were edited and content analyzed in place of the literal transcriptions. In addition, the quality of the audio recordings was poor at times resulting in some loss of information.

Focus group discussion was organized roughly around a script (see Appendix A) utilizing three one-hour time blocks:

The first block discussed instances in which language training has been used in a field setting, instances when additional or better language training would have been useful, what level of language proficiency is typically required, and types of tasks that involved use of a foreign language.

The second block discussed focus group members' foreign language training experiences. Specific topics mentioned were (1) where in the course of SOF training should language training occur, (2) what types of language training are most/least effective, (3) what are some of the barriers or things that keep SOF personnel from maintaining or enhancing language skills, and (4) what things would motivate SOF personnel or make it easier for them to take advantage of language training.

The third block was a bit different. In this block focus group members were given 20 minutes to prepare a presentation based on one of two formats (see Appendix A for details). Generally speaking, these presentations involved best practices for language training (sequencing, type of training, etc.) and ways to overcome barriers to language acquisition.

The content analyses for these focus groups were conducted as described below.

Method

We used a grounded theory (Glaser, 1992; Glaser & Strauss, 1967) approach to content analyze the data from the focus groups described above.   Grounded theory is designed to facilitate the process of discovering meaning by making use of iterative categorical coding of the data (Willig, 1996). Grounded theory provides two primary advantages over other qualitative methods: (1) the use of categorical coding allows for traditional quantitative analysis of the data, and (2) by coding in an iterative manner, categories can be created, revised, and ultimately grouped in a hierarchical manner in order to optimally summarize the data, or if so desired, to derive theories regarding the structure of the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

In analyzing the data using a grounded theory approach, we followed the following steps:
1. The Primary Investigator (PI) read approximately half of all focus group transcriptions. After reading these transcriptions, broad categories of discussion topics were derived that tended to loosely follow the script utilized by the session facilitator.
2. Once broad categories were derived, more specific categories were developed within each broad topical category. Specific categories pertained to common themes or issues raised within the broader context of the

discussion topic.

3. These categories were used to code the remaining comments, though changes were made to category labels.
4. Within each broad discussion category, a category of "other" was used when discussion seemed to pertain to the broad discussion topic, but was not adequately captured by a specific code.
5. Once initial coding was completed, "other" categories were reviewed. Those deemed similar enough to existing codes were reassigned values to reflect this similarity.
6. Commonly reoccurring "other" comments were classified as new categories were added to the coding scheme.
7. All project team members including the PI checked category content throughout the project.
8. Once summary tabulations were made, infrequently used coding blocks were deleted. Comments assigned to those codes were classified as "other" comments within their appropriate broad category.
9. Steps 5-7 above were repeated in order to ensure that frequently reoccurring content was appropriately tabulated.
10. Lastly, multiple raters blindly categorized a small subset of comments in order to assess the reliability of the coding process. This step addresses the issue of consistency or agreement of the raters.

Please note that not every "comment" was coded. For example, questions posed by the focus group moderator were generally not coded, though yes/no responses to direct questions typically were coded.

Analyses

Once all comments were coded, the unity type, active status, and codes were combined into one master document. This document contained codes for all coded comments along with identifying information for the unit from which the comment came. This document constituted the master document from which all analyses were conducted.

Notes on Content Analysis:

Though the goal of content analysis is to quantify the content of an open-ended inquiry as accurately as possible, there is no one best method for conducting a content analysis. In this study, we categorized content and then conducted frequency analyses to discern how often content categories were mentioned. However, frequencies can be misleading in some situations. In a moderated discussion, topics will tend to surface more often due to moderator influence. As an example, few of the focus groups tended to discuss distributed learning (DL) training tools unless they were directly presented with a question regarding the effectiveness or feasibility of DL tools. A pure count of the frequencies of topics discussed might give undue weight to DL.

Additionally, some topics are hard to categorize by their very nature. In a focus group format, some speakers tended to talk at great length while others were quite succinct. While long, sometimes multi-page, statements tend to encompass a number of topics they can also restate a single premise multiple times. Such comments can be difficult to quantify as different speakers may use different language or make slightly different statements on a topic. Such statements require judgment on the part of the analyst regarding how to classify the statement (use existing, though slightly different, categories, or create a new "other category") and whether to attribute multiple instances to a single category.

Finally, speaker's names were omitted in the focus group transcripts in order to preserve confidentiality. Instead, the gender of the speaker is indicated. While the goal of such an omission is commendable, it is typically impossible to identify how often a particular participant speaks, as nearly all speakers in the sessions are male. As a result, it is difficult to determine whether one person reiterates the same point several times or if several persons are discussing the same topic. One example of this can be seen in examining comments related to the importance of language immersion training techniques. In reading some transcripts, it is difficult to determine whether one speaker brings up this issue multiple times or if several speakers speak to the importance of these techniques. If the former case, a count of the frequencies would imply that immersion training is very important even though it may only be of primary importance to one vocal focal group discussant.

Moreover, due to poor audio quality, some focus group transcriptions were missing significant data. While most comments were clearly transcribed, for others some words or phrases were missing. For such statements, the gist of

the statement being made was readily transparent at times. Other times however, crucial words or phrases were missing from the transcription. In these cases missing data generally made categorization impossible. Such cases were generally noted and categorized as "missing".

Lastly, frequency counts of content also give can give little indication of the importance of the topics discussed. For example, in discussions of instances where a lack of language training can be detrimental, participants can (and often do) discuss situations in which a lack of adequate training could cause loss of life for SOF personnel. Such comments speak to the vital importance of adequate training but, if only mentioned once, could be given no more weight than a response to a direct question from an administrator (e.g. regarding the applicability of DL method).

While the above points outline several limitations of quantification of content analyses, an objective analysis of the content of the focus groups must rely on quantification at its heart. Such quantification helps to ensure that all discussed content is accounted for in some way by the analyst and can help prevent analyst bias from coloring a content analysis report.

As a result, in this study, we have tried to marry quantitative methods and qualitative readings of the focus group transcripts. While quantitative results are presented and interpreted, a more subjecting reading of the focus group transcripts themselves were also used in reaching conclusions and implications from the focus groups.

Description of Categories Derived

Focus group discussion was organized roughly around a script (see Appendix A) used by the facilitators. Though groups did frequently steer discussion away from the script, the script is useful for developing broad categories of the discussion that occurred. Focus group blocks provide a natural categorization of content, though there was overlap of content between blocks. Comments in Block 3, in particular, seemed to largely restate themes mentioned earlier. However, the format of Block 3 (group presentations) tended to provide more structure than did comments in Blocks 1 and 2. As a result, broad categories were developed for each block of questions and redundancies were eliminated. For this reason, some codes originally developed for one block are sometimes used to code comments in another block (e.g., Block 3 codes were assigned to comments appearing in Block 2 of the focus group).

The detailed coding document for Blocks 1-3 can be found in Appendices B, C, and D, respectively.

Rater Agreement

In order to assess inter-rater agreement, four raters independently and blindly coded one block of data. With dozens of potential categories for coding, typical measures of interrater agreement are not applicable. Traditional approaches ask raters to rate how well the comment matches each potential rating category, or use a chi-square based statistic to match the classification of categories assigned. While, those these techniques work well when choosing between two or three potential categories, they are simply not tenable with several dozen.

Instead, simple descriptive statistics are reported with respect to the percent agreement. In the block rated (PO11 – Block 3), a total of 29 comments were given ratings. Of these, there was some agreement on assigned codes for 23 of 29, or 79% of the comments.

Of the 23 comments for which there was interrater agreement, 4 (17%) had perfect agreement among all four raters, there were 10 comments (44%) from which 3 of the 4 raters agreed, and there were 9 (39%) comments for which two raters agreed.

Though there are no set rules with regards to levels of agreement, these levels were quite high. These high levels of agreement are particularly impressive when considering that raters could choose from over 100 Block 3 codes, in addition to codes from Blocks 1 and 2 that could be, and were, utilized. The probability of any two raters choosing the same rating code for a given comment by chance alone is less than 4%. That 80% of the comments were coded with agreement among raters is rather remarkable.

Results

The results of the quantitative analysis and a more qualitative reading of the transcripts are described below. Results are presented by overall analyses. Next, all active unit analyses are summarized followed by all reserve units. Lastly, results are summarized by SOF type (in alphabetical order). In cases in which active and reserve comments differed by SOF type, results are presented separately for these groups.

Frequency results are presented with considerable detail for overall comparisons. Results by active and reserve forces sum to those found in the overall analyses and thus are described in much less detail. Typically only frequencies are reported.

Results are then provided by SOF type. Typically results of active and reserve units were combined in reporting by SOF type. However, distinctions between these groups for a given SOF type were highlighted in text.

Frequency results were discussed in detail for AF and SOF types. However, given the amount of detail regarding content categories in the overview section and the redundancy between comments across SOF types, much less detail was provided for other SOF types with regards to frequency analyses.

For all focus groups conducted, a brief narrative summary of main highlights are provided. This information, along with results from the frequency analyses, was used to report summary conclusions for each SOF type.

Finally, after all results were reported, final recommendations are given in a separate section.

Broad Categories Overview

As is common with moderated discussion groups, conversation tended to organize around the prearranged script described earlier. However, there was considerable variation in discussion topic by both moderator and SOF unit participating in the focus group. Such variation is to be expected as different moderators tended to allow differing degrees of divergence from the prearranged scripts. Perhaps more significantly, SOF units differed significantly in language usage, training experiences and opportunities, and leader emphasis on language training. Nonetheless, broad categories for each question block are described below:

As a final note regarding frequency data, generally speaking comparisons of comment category frequency are more useful *within* a given broad category than *across* broad categories. This is because the general direction of the conversation can be easily steered by a single session participant and the session moderator. Because of this influence, comparisons across broad content categories can give a misleading impression of their importance.

As an example, the first question block typically started out by asking participants about their experiences using language in the field. As a result, frequencies regarding the type of task performed are typically much larger than those for topics scheduled to appear later in the session (see Appendix A), such as the use of job aids. Often conversation would go in a direction that did not closely follow the prearranged script and as a result, job aids were not explicitly discussed in every session. Indeed, aids such as Kwikpoint were discussed so infrequently that they were removed from the coding scheme (see Appendix B) due to infrequent usage. Based on frequency counts, it would appear that the type of task being performed might be particularly important to the session respondents while the use of job aids is not. However, this is not likely the case.

A more useful approach regarding quantitative comparisons is to look at frequency data within a broad category. While little can be said about the importance of the type of task performed compared to the use of job aids (comparisons across categories), it is with some certainty that the specific types of tasks (training missions and other types of missions) can be compared.

Question Block 1

Question Block 1 centered on issues of language use in field settings. An outline identifying common themes that emerged appears in Figure 1 below. Broad categories of discussion are represented by major bullet points. Minor bullet points identify more specific topical areas within their broader context.

Figure 1. Outline of Broad and Specific Topics Discussed in First Question Block

- Descriptions of tasks performed
  - Type of task
  - Specificity of language needs
    - Local dialect or more global language
    - Military specific or colloquial language
  - Importance of proficiency to the task
  - Proficiencies needed - Speaking, reading, writing, listening
  - Environmental context
    - Prevalence of English in the country
    - Cultural understanding of the location
- Use of job aids
  - Interpreters
    - Military or locally provided
    - Prevalence of use of interpreters
    - Special issues in selecting local interpreters
  - Other job aids – note cards, electronic devices, non-verbal communication
- Benefits of language proficiency
  - Low-level proficiency – navigation, control in conflict situations, builds credibility with locals
  - Advanced proficiency – contextual awareness, information gained, reduced personnel/resource needs
  - Unspecified proficiency – building trust/rapport, enhancing communication effectiveness, increased mission efficiency, increased situational awareness, increased mission intelligence information
- Language usage/additional training needs
  - Spoken, written
  - Formal language, colloquial/slang, local dialects
  - Cultural information
  - Classroom, immersion training

As can be seen above, broad topical discussion followed relatively closely to that of the prearranged focus group script (see Appendix A). However, participants often could not resist the temptation to discuss additional training needs in the first comment block. This is to be expected as participants were asked explicitly what specific language skills (e.g. reading, writing, speaking, listening) they used while in the field. Clearly proficiencies commonly used would also be deemed import for training.

Specifics content and example comments for each category will be provided in the Overall Results section. The actual rating code guide used to categorize Block 1 comments appears in Appendix B.

Question Block 2

Question Block 2 explicitly asked participants about their previous training experiences. Topics covered included what types of experiences were highly effective and which were not effective and issues in proficiency assessment. Given the wide diversity of training experiences, requirements, and emphasis of language training given by the unit leadership, experiences differed considerably by SOF type. Additionally, reserve/National Guard units identified a large number of issues specific to their situation. These issues, while emerging across all three question blocks, tended to be discussed more in the second block. Further, some groups, such as SF groups, were all from the same unit and tended to discuss their particular training programs. Such comments are typically not applicable to all SOF types. The net effect of this diversity of comments was a question block that was more difficult to code and categorize than other questions blocks.

Lastly, categories were coded based on content not the block in which they were stated. As a result of the structuring of the focus groups, there was considerable overlap in content between the second and third question blocks. The specific structural guidance provided to participants in the third question block provided a nice framework for structuring discussion of training recommendations for that block. Given the natural structure of that question block, Question Block 3 codes were used to categorize many comments that occurred during the second question block. As a result, the structure of the second question block appearing below tends to be comprised mostly of more specific issues (i.e., less 'big picture' issues) than the third question block.

An overview of the broad topics for Question Block 2 is given in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2. Outline of broad and specific topics discussed in second question block

- Factors leading to training effectiveness
    - Immersion training issues
    - Other issues:
        - Pre-deployment preparation tools
        - Factors that contribute to preparation
        - Motivation for learning languages
- Alternatives to typical classroom and immersion training
- Issues with proficiency assessment
    - DLPT problems and issues
    - Need for speaking to be assessed
- Special issues with reservists / National Guard
    - Constraints
        - Time
        - Resources – training availability, materials (e.g. language labs)
        - Pay issues
        - Limited support from leadership

The actual rating code guide used to categorize Block 2 comments appears in Appendix C.

Question Block 3

Question Block 3 was organized differently than Blocks 1 and 2. In Block 3, participants were given 20 minutes to prepare a set of training recommendations for their SOF Unit. Topics covered appear in Figure 3 below.

Figure 3. Outline of broad and specific topics discussed in second question block

- Language skills importance
    - Priorities, proficiency level needed
    - Skills - speaking, listening, writing, reading, other
- Training timing
    - Initial / classroom training
        - Emphasis – military, colloquial/slang
    - Refresher/maintenance training
        - Type – classroom, immersion, distributed learning, language labs
        - Frequency
        - Maintenance issues
- Efficacy of training types
- Barriers to effective training
    - Barriers
        - Financial
        - Time
        - Resources

- ▪ Leadership emphasis
    - o Steps to overcome barriers
- Improving motivation to be proficient
    - o Pay recommendations
    - o Other recommendations
- Ways to improve training
- Other issues:
    - o Voluntary or mandatory training

The actual rating code guide used to categorize Block 3 comments appears in Appendix D.

Overall Results

As stated previously, comments were categorized by topic, not the session in which they appear. As a result, it is not as useful to report findings based on when a comment was said (i.e., in which block). It is more useful to describe conversations as they pertain to the categories associated with each block (as described above). The summary results represent the frequency and prevalence of topic discussion arranged by topics as they correspond to the blocks. In other words, a comment that is mentioned in the Block 2 session may appear in the Block 3 results if the topic of that comment corresponds to those in Block 3 as described above.

Question Block 1

Situational Description

The tables below describe the basics of the tasks discussed during all focus groups.

Table 3. Tasks Performed, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*Tasks performed?*
64	Training others
37	Missions
8	other

As can be seen above, most comments indicated that tasks were related primarily to training. While the specifics of the missions were not discussed, most of these categories involved training military personnel in other countries. The missions served as a classification for almost any other type of job duty in which language was used. The Other category was used infrequently and was occasionally used if it was impossible to determine whether the tasks were training or mission related.

Table 4. Language Specificity, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*Which language was required of the mission:*
56	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
28	National language
34	Specific local dialect
2	Other

Comments were split regarding the particular proficiency needed. While the most frequent comment code used was for general languages (e.g., Spanish), as often a general language was not sufficient. Very often regional dialects (such as in South-East Asia or the Middle-East) varied greatly making comprehension more difficult without some detailed exposure (such as that gained from immersion training). In many instances a national-level language (e.g., Egyptian Arabic) was sufficient.

Table 5. Level of Proficiency Required, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*Level of proficiency required on the mission*
16	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases – listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
19	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
15	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful

5	other

Overall, comments were not often explicit as to the level of proficiency needed to perform a task or job. When this information was explicitly provided and coded, it appears that different levels of proficiency are needed for different tasks.

Table 6. Importance of Proficiency Required, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?*
7	Not at all
5	A little
10	A moderate amount
19	A lot

Again, specific information regarding the importance of language proficiency was not often provided. When it was mentioned, more importance was typically indicated more often than less importance. However, given the relatively low numbers of comments coded, these numbers are not the best reflection of the importance of proficiency.

Table 7. Nature of Vocabulary Required, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*Proficiencies needed?*
34	General language (around town)
34	Technical-job related or military terms
4	other

One theme that came up in numerous sessions was the importance of different types of language skills and vocabulary. In some instances, such as training foreign troops, vocabulary regarding military specific terms was deemed important. For example, knowing the names of the parts of a riffle in Spanish was important for some training missions in South America. For others, speaking and gathering information from locals was more important. In these instances, knowledge of general language used in towns and locations was more important. On this issue, comments were very evenly divided.

Table 8. Proficiency Importance, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*Which is more important?*
65	Speaking
7	Reading
9	Writing
35	Listening
3	other

Overwhelming, and as reported later, across all SOF types, speaking and listening were consistently rated as the most important proficiencies needed. Speaking came out clearly on top, with listening a distant second. While other proficiencies such as reading and writing were mentioned at times, they were top priorities for very few individuals in SOF.

Table 9. Cultural Importance, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
13	Helpful but not essential
25	Essential
4	other

Though comments were not plentiful, understanding the culture of the country within which persons were working was a common theme. This information is also captured elsewhere in the focus groups, such as when discussing the advantages of immersion training. In general, those working more directly with the public and those in more dangerous locations (e.g., Iraq) tended to find cultural knowledge more important and useful than those working more with foreign military personnel and in safer locations.

Table 10. Prevalence of English Speakers, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*Do the locals typically speak English*
8	Most of them
13	Some of them
7	Few of them
10	None of them

Discussions of whether locals typically speak English were seldom mentioned. When such comments were coded, a mix of none, few, many, and most was discussed. However, given the low frequencies of codes for this category these statements may not be representative of all experiences.

Use of Job Aides

Several comments in Block 1 dealt with the use of job aids for language understanding

Interpreters

Table 11. Frequency of Interpreter Usage, Overall Analyses

Frequencies	*How often*
17	yes - local interpreters, frequently
10	yes - local interpreters, infrequently
17	yes - military provided interpreters, frequently
1	yes - military provided interpreters, infrequently
5	rarely used interpreters

Several persons mentioned using interpreters. However, the frequency with which they are used was typically not volunteered unless prompted by the focus group moderator. When this information was provided, most persons reported using interpreters. However, if no person in a session had used an interpreter, this topic would not have likely been discussed and thus would not be recorded.

Table 12. Importance of Interpreters to Mission, Overall Analyses

Frequencies	*How important is it to use interpreters*
22	Essential
12	Helpful
2	Of little use

For those that had used an interpreter in the past, most reported that they were helpful or essential.

Table 13. Issues in Interpreter Selection, Overall Analyses

Frequencies	*Issues in selecting interpreter*
26	Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
7	Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
7	As long as they speak English their OK
19	Proper selection interpreters is important
13	Can't trust interpreters
2	other interpreter issues

Despite their frequent use, some respondents commented on the need for caution in selecting interpreters. For example, several comments indicated that they could, at times, do more harm than good. An example comment is "The interpreter wasn't really saying the things we were supposed to be saying, and he shot a person with his... ".

Similar types of comments (though often less extreme) are coded under the "proper selection of interpreters is important" category. An example comment coded to that category is "I had an interpreter that when I negotiate by __ services, he would raise the prices instead of trying to get the lower price.", and "...we had a native speaker who was sitting among the other soldiers. He didn't want to say that he spoke the language yet... So, we laid on the interpreter, and the interpreter came in and interpreted for us. The guy is shaking his head and saying, 'That isn't even close.'"

Several other persons noted a reluctance to trust interpreters. Examples of these instances include examples of interpreters talking much more than they should to convey the message, reluctance to translate some phrases, or an inability to successfully convey emphasis and meaning.

Other Job Aides

Table 14. Use of Other Job Aides, Overall Analyses

Frequencies	*Note cards with phrases*
6	sometime
1	always
1	other
	jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal
15	on occasion
19	*other*

Other job aides were also discussed, though rarely. Some comments indicated that respondents made note cards or other homemade devices. Some persons indicated the use of non-verbal communication as well.

Interestingly, codes were initially developed for other job aides such as electronic gadgets and devices (e.g., Kwikpoint). However, these topics came up so infrequently in the focus groups that they were merged in with the "other category codes").

General Themes Identified

Remaining comments in Question Block 1 were grouped under general themes. The first of these categories relates to increased needs for training. These themes generally came up while discussing language usage on the job. Though training needs were generally discussed more in Blocks 2 and 3 (and similar comments are coded in those blocks), it is natural for similar topics to be discussed in Block 1.

Table 15. Additional Language Training Needs, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*Additional Language Training Needs*
19	Spoken
5	Written
27	Street/slang
8	Formal/presentation language
7	Flexibility - broad range of skills
26	Cultural language training
11	Cultural non-verbal language training
10	Dialect Training
14	Immersion training
10	More time in formal classes
19	Other

Common themes related to additional broad training needs were quite varied. More common themes were the need for street/colloquial/slang training. Many units deal directly with local populations and reported that their formal language training was not appropriate for everyday use.

Another popular theme was the need for cultural training/awareness (as manifest via both language and non-verbal communication). Training for specific local dialects was also indicated as a need, as was a desire for immersion and classroom training.

The next broad grouping was in response to direct moderator prompting as to the benefits of language proficiency. When possible, these benefits were coded separately for basic and advanced proficiency. However, often was impossible to determine the proficiency level discussed.

Table 16. Benefits of Language Proficiency, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*Benefits of proficiency:*
	Basic
17	Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
12	Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
14	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	More advanced

Frequency	*Benefits of proficiency:*
8	Identifying important documents in another language
5	Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
14	Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
3	other
	Unspecified
57	Builds rapport/trust
28	Enhances communication effectiveness
14	Increases efficiency/speed of mission
17	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
19	Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
4	Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
15	Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
2	other

Even basic proficiency was associated with substantial benefits, particularly maintaining control in ambiguous situations. Some personnel reported being able to defuse a rapidly escalating conflict situation via a few simple terms in another language. An example comment is: "A man came walking out the compound and didn't know that we were there. With what I've learned from the interpreter, I was able to immediately tell him to put his hands up and get up and be quiet and stay where you are."

More advanced language also was associated with substantial rewards such as reducing reliance on translators, gaining significant information, and specifically, identifying important documents.

Increased awareness was also frequently mentioned as a benefit of proficiency with a sample comment being: "...and so they were saying 'Come back, Saddam' So if we hear something like that, we might realize immediately that we're in some sort of anti-U.S. thing and we can get out of the situation or whatever."

Though more mundane, many persons emphasized the benefits of proficiency with respect to building trust or rapport with others. These comments emerged both from training tasks (ensuring better relations with other countries military) and in dealing with local persons. Many comments indicated that these better relationships resulted in crucial information that would otherwise be unavailable, such as increased intelligence.

 The last general theme from this block relates to consequences of a lack of language proficiency.

Table 17. Consequences of a Lack of Language Proficiency, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*Consequences of a lack of proficiency:*
31	Can be dangerous
11	May causes mission abort/failure
23	May slow mission
29	May decrease mission effectiveness
9	May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)
7	Can lead to selection of inappropriate translator

A common comment from this grouping was possibility of jeopardizing personal safety when language proficiency is poor. As an example: "in Iraq right now for example, when the insurgents place a bomb, a roadside bomb, a lot of times they spray-paint on a wall or on the side of the roads, somewhere on the way up there, in Arabic, 'bomb' to

warn the locals that something is there. And most Americans, you know, can't read Arabic so it's just more scribbling on the wall to them, yet if you can read the language, you know, hey, that's not right."

Others indicated that a mission may be slowed, less effective, fail, or be aborted outright due to language constraints. For example: "The last place we went, I had an interpreter with me and then another guy with another group of snipers. Because of the way the communications were set up, we didn't have anybody at each position speaking the language. One position is talking back to their commander, and the whole operations ended up kicking off earlier than it ever should have."

Question Block 2

Issues in Block 2 tended to focus around specific training experiences. As such, coding was difficult at times for this block. In particular, developing a single coding scheme for an extremely diverse set of experiences was challenging. Moreover, moderators tended to let session participants expand on their individual experiences and suggestions for improving training. The net effect was that many comments were coded as "other" comments.

Issues in Training Effectiveness

The first issue arising in Block 2 involved training effectiveness.

In general, immersion training was very popular both because of the effectiveness of this type of training (from both a language and cultural perspective) and because most persons had very positive experiences during immersion training. Frequencies are reported below:

Table 18. Issues in Immersion Training, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*with immersion*
4	timing (too long before deployment)
18	immersed with others or by self
25	cultural aspect of immersion is important
12	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
32	other

Other comments with regards to immersion training were quite diverse and are discussed in more detail when reporting by SOF type.

While captured more adequately in Block 3 codes regarding barriers to language acquisition, a few comments were related to factors that contribute to a lack of preparation:

Table 19. Barriers to Adequate Language Preparation, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*Issues that contribute to a lack of preparation*
9	missions in many locations
15	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
10	other

Typically these comments related to a lower priority for language training and a diversity of locations requiring proficiency in different languages.

Very few comments related to the preparation before deployment in which respondents engaged.

Table 20. Tools for Language Preparation, Overall Analyses

Frequency	Tools to use in training/preparation
9	reading – to build vocabulary
8	language labs are very valuable
8	other

Several comments related to why people learn languages.

Table 21. Motivation for Acquiring/Maintaining Language Proficiency, Overall Analyses

Frequency	Why do people learn languages
8	Current pay is not a strong motivator
10	Pride / wanting to do a better job
14	To make missions easier on themselves
8	Pay
16	other

With the current compensation system, some comments indicated that pay was not a strong factor. Other factors included personal pride and easier mission performance. However, it is unknown if persons who are motivated by pay factors simply did not comment.

Alternative Training Techniques

Several comments related to possible alternatives to traditional training techniques. These comments, however, tended to vary enormously from suggesting new methods altogether, to providing suggestions for slightly modifying existing techniques.

Table 22. Possible Alternative Training Techniques, Overall Analyses

Frequency	Possible alternatives to traditional training
3	pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
5	tutoring in specific languages
12	immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site
33	other
	Issues
5	immersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks
5	DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them
2	other

One of the more novel ideas that occurred frequently was to engage in some type of stateside immersion training. On such occasions, persons would go to a location with a group of others, possibly with an instructor, and only speak a given language for the duration of the trip. Variants of this technique (coded as other) included having dedicated times/days during which a unit will only speak a certain language, and having trail runs of training activities in a language before deployment.

The next topic discussed related to the role of Distributive Learning (DL) and Technology Delivered Training (TDT). Typically these comments came in response to direct prompting by the moderator. Very few persons had

overly positive comments about the technology, although several persons thought they could play a useful role in language maintenance. Overall, however, there was not a lot of enthusiasm for these techniques.

Table 23. The Role of DL and TDT Training, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*would DL, TDT solutions be effective*
1	maybe a little
10	yes, anything helps
3	other
	other comments about DL, TDT
2	Rosetta stone program is really helpful
3	other
10	*DL, TDT not very effective*
4	*DL, etc. should be more widely available*

Issues in Proficiency Assessment

Several comments related to proficiency assessment. In particular, some units perceived a serious incongruence between their reliance on speaking for the job and the DLPT's lack of speaking assessment.

Table 24. Issues in Proficiency Assessment, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*DLPT*
4	Needs to be less military specific
7	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
3	is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
31	needs improvement
8	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
24	other
9	is not a valid measure of usage in the field
	On the need for speaking to be assessed
33	Needs to incorporate speaking into DLPT some way / Use OPI
8	other comments
	OPI
8	Is a good test
2	Is too subjective
6	other comments
1	Other

Issues with Specific Programs

During Block 2, groups were encouraged to discuss their particular training experiences. Given the many different SOF types represented, training experiences were quite varied. Respondents had many comments related to their individual experiences. Some of those comments are summarized below. However, many comments were so varied that they were coded as "other".

Table 25. Issues with Specific Training Programs, Overall Analyses

Frequency	DLI Arabic program
3	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
3	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
2	other comments
	DLI courses in general
9	Need a greater speaking focus
18	Spend too much time teaching specifically for DLPT
17	other comments
	Berlitz
8	other comments
	SWC
4	Not enough focus on military language
3	Not long enough
11	other comments
	other programs
18	other comments

While Block 2 was used to code comments dealing specifically with special issues of reservists, those comments are presented later along with summary results for reserve personnel.

Question Block 3

Block 3 comments included firm recommendations for language training and many broad topics. Given the group presentation format for this block, overall frequencies tend to be lower for this block.

Language Competency Priorities

As indicated below and mentioned earlier, speaking and listening skills were by far the most commonly mentioned top priorities.

Table 26. Language Skill Proficiency Top Priorities, Overall Analyses

Frequency	#1 priority
29	speaking
15	listening
1	writing
	reading
3	other

Table 27. Language Skill Proficiency Secondary Priorities, Overall Analyses

Frequency	#2 priority
2	speaking

11	listening
	writing
4	reading
1	other

Few comments explicitly indicated what proficiency levels are needed. However, recommendations were quite varied as evidenced below.

Table 28. Level of Proficiency Needed, Overall Analyses

Frequency	what proficiency levels are needed
6	1-1
9	2-2
6	3-3
4	can have a variety within a given unit
13	other

Initial Acquisition

Training recommendations regarding the timing of training also tended to vary, specifically by SOF type (see later summaries). Typically, proponents of early training pointed to a lack of time or opportunity after initial training was complete. Others pointed to the usefulness of training just before deployment while others still indicated that with training burnout, language training may be best after first going to work with the unit for some period of time.

Table 29. Most Appropriate Training Sequence, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*when in pipeline?*
15	early – as part of some of the first training that occurs
13	late but before being sent to unit – just before send off to unit
8	very late – after sent to unit (to prevent burnout)
6	other

In this block, comments regarding the types of languages that should be taught were few. Of the few comments, a mix of military jargon and street language was indicated (varying often by SOF type).

Table 30. Emphasis of Language Training, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*primary emphasis should be?*
9	military language
6	street language
3	equal mix
4	other

Maintenance/Refresher Training

Type and length of language maintenance/refresher training suggestions varied as well. While most comments advocated immersion training, the utility of other types of training were also indicated. Of note, initially the coding scheme involved separate ratings for maintenance and refresher training (with maintenance being of shorter duration and more frequent intervals than refresher training). However, some coders had difficultly appropriately differentiating between the two so those ratings were merged.

Table 31. Language Maintenance/Refresher Training Techniques, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*type?*
10	language lab
4	DL
1	college classes
33	immersion
18	classroom (DLI, etc.)
11	language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)
12	other

Frequency of maintenance training recommendations also varied. Typically, shorter intervals were advocated for DL, language lab, and language day activities while longer intervals were suggested for immersion and classroom training.

Table 32. Interval of Maintenance/Refresher Training , Overall Analyses

Frequency	*how often?*
5	weekly
4	monthly
14	other
10	annually

A few issues in maintenance training was also mentioned, such as providing more incentive for ongoing training.

Table 33. Issues in Maintenance Training, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*issues in maintenance*
3	should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
4	other

Almost every comment suggested that at least some classroom work was required for initial acquisition, though immersion shortly thereafter was also often suggested. Immersion was typically the preferred method of refresher training.

Table 34. Best Training Techniques, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*for initial acquisition*
10	classroom
16	classroom/immersion combo
12	other
	for sustaining/enhancing
14	immersion
16	other

Most respondents felt that some training should be mandatory for everyone (exceptions are found in a couple of reserve units comments). However, many comments indicated the need to allow more advanced training on a voluntary basis.

Table 35. Mandatory or Voluntary Training Opinions, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*Should training be voluntary or involuntary*
22	mandatory for all
3	voluntary
7	based on aptitude/interest
19	basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
5	other

Barriers to Language Acquisition and Maintenance

In this block, respondents were asked to explicitly list the barriers to language acquisition and maintenance.

Table 36. Barriers to Language Acquisition and Maintenance, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*What are these barriers?*
21	financial costs of training
57	no time for dedicated long period of language training
11	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
6	no language lab
21	low priority for leadership
8	time not being used efficiently
25	other
10	other lack of resources
1	lack of awareness of resources
4	no structured program/maintenance

The biggest barrier for most groups tended to be time constraints. These constraints were manifest both by a lack of long periods of availability for training, and personnel/job constraints. Some groups indicated that leadership did not

put a high priority on language training. These comments seemed particularly true for some reserve units. While some groups indicated that there were financial constraints limiting training, a more detailed reading of the comments typically indicated that financial constraints were presumed more often than encountered. In other words, few persons had been told that money was not available for training. More often, group members would name time and money as constraints (in almost a knee-jerk reaction) then clarify that time was the bigger constraint. Some groups also indicated a lack of resources for training and/or maintenance (such as language labs). Several comments were categorized as "other" and are expanded upon in the SOF type summaries later.

With regards to how barriers can be removed, the following comments were categorized. Again, other comments are explained in more detail in SOF type summaries.

Table 37. Ways to Remove Barriers to Language Acquisition and Maintenance, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*How can they be removed?*
5	discretionary language funds for units
18	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
3	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
6	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
18	other

Increasing Motivation

With respect to methods that can be used to increase motivation to learn and maintain language skills, several comments related to pay. As evidenced below, many of these defied neat categorization. These other comments are expanded upon in the SOF type summaries. Other comments suggested ensuring that languages learned will be used in the field. Although coded as "other" some groups also mentioned offering immersion training as an award due to its popularity.

Table 38. Ways to Increase Language Acquisition and Maintenance Motivation, Overall Analyses

Frequency	**Motivator**
	pay
9	pay based on language difficulty
5	no cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated
3	pay separately for proficiency in speaking than in listening/reading comprehension
3	pay based on the number of years you have maintained proficiency
7	more pay using current compensation system
6	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
25	other
	practical use
6	make sure they will be used in the field
3	other
	recognition
5	any type
	other

Frequency	**Motivator**
8	try and select those with prior language exposure
23	other
4	hold people accountable

Potential Improvements

There are several suggestions for ways to improve training:

Table 39. Specific Ways to Improve Training, Overall Analyses

Frequency	*Ways to improve training*
1	Instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
3	Allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
5	SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
7	Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
3	Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
2	Keep class size small (under 10)
6	Other comments
1	Make proficiency a requirement to be eligible to deploy
1	Actually practice training sessions (they will be done down-range) in the native language stateside
5	CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
1	Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
7	Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
16	Other comments

Results by Active/Reserve Status

As general descriptions of categories are provided above, primarily frequencies are provided for active duty versus reserve breakdowns of the comment content. In addition, results are provided in more detail for SOF types with comparisons between active and reserve units made when applicable. These results were used to draw conclusions found in the overall recommendations section. Given the different experiences and training needs of the different SOF types, more detailed conclusions about reserve and active status groups are provided in those sections.

Active Units

Question Block 1

Situational Description

Much like the overall results, results for active duty personnel indicated that most missions were training missions, with a mixed need for language specificity, level of proficiency, and importance of proficiency.

Table 40. Tasks Performed, Active Units

Frequencies	*Tasks performed?*
61	Training others
27	Missions
7	other

Table 41. Language Specificity, Active Units

Frequencies	*Which language was required of the mission:*
47	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
16	National language
25	Specific local dialect
2	other

Table 42. Level of Proficiency Required, Active Units

Frequencies	*Level of proficiency required on the mission*
11	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases - listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
13	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
12	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful
2	other

Table 43. Importance of Proficiency Required, Active Units

Frequencies	How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?
7	Not at all
5	A little
8	A moderate amount
11	A lot

Also, like the overall analyses, technical language skills were commented upon slightly more than general language (consistent with training mission activities). Speaking and listening were by far the most important types of proficiency.

Table 44. Nature of Vocabulary Required, Active Units

Frequencies	*Proficiencies needed?*
18	General language (around town)
26	Technical-job related or military terms
4	other

Table 45. Proficiency Importance, Active Units

Frequencies	*Which is more important?*
46	Speaking
3	Reading
4	Writing
21	Listening
3	other

Table 46. Cultural Importance, Active Units

Frequencies	*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
10	Helpful but not essential
18	Essential
2	other

Table 47. Prevalence of English Speakers, Active Units

Frequencies	*Do the natives typically speak English*
7	Most of them
9	Some of them
5	Few of them
9	None of them

Use of Job Aides

Interpreters

Comments related to interpreters indicated that they were used on occasion, though the number of comments were not large. Those who had used interpreters found them very useful.

Table 48. Frequency of Interpreter Usage, Active Units

Frequencies	*How often*
9	yes - local interpreters, frequently
6	yes - local interpreters, infrequently
10	yes - military provided interpreters, frequently
1	yes - military provided interpreters, infrequently
5	rarely used interpreters

Table 49. Importance of Interpreters to Mission, Active Units

Frequencies	*How important is it to use interpreters*
15	Essential
6	Helpful
2	Of little use

Table 50. Issues in Interpreter Selection, Active Units

Frequencies	*Issues in selecting interpreter*
14	Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
4	Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
3	As long as they speak English their OK
9	Proper selection interpreters is important
10	Can't trust interpreters
1	other interpreter issues

Other Job Aides

Table 51. Use of Other Job Aides, Active Units

	Note cards with phrases
1	sometime
1	always
	jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal
10	on occasion
13	other

General Themes Identified

Additional Training Needs

Table 52. Additional Language Training Needs, Active Units

Frequencies	Additional Language Training Needs
12	Spoken
4	Written
15	Street/slang
8	Formal/presentation language
3	Flexibility - broad range of skills
9	Cultural language training
7	Cultural non-verbal language training
5	Dialect Training
12	Immersion training
2	More time in formal classes
13	Other

Also as with overall analyses, a need for street slang as well as formal language was emphasized in several comments. Cultural appreciation of the location in which personnel were working was also a common theme.

Benefits of language proficiency

Table 53. Benefits of Language Proficiency, Active Units

Frequencies	Basic
6	Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
8	Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
6	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	More advanced
7	Identifying important documents in another language
2	Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
10	Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
3	other
	Unspecified
37	Builds rapport/trust
13	Enhances communication effectiveness
9	Increases efficiency/speed of mission
10	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
13	Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)

Frequencies	*Basic*
2	Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
14	Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
1	other

As indicated in the overall summary, active duty personnel made many comments indicating that they fully appreciated the benefits of language skills, both basic and advanced, as well as the negative consequences due to a lack of language abilities.

Consequences of a Lack of Proficiency

Table 54. Consequences of a Lack of Language Proficiency, Active Units

Frequencies	*Consequences of a lack of proficiency:*
22	Can be dangerous
7	May causes mission abort/failure
17	May slow mission
21	May decrease mission effectiveness
6	May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)

Question Block 2

Issues in Training Effectiveness

Several comments were geared specifically towards issues involved with immersion training, though many defied categorization (evaluation of some "other" comments are provided for results by SOF type).

Table 55. Issues in Immersion Training, Active Units

Frequency	*with immersion*
4	timing (too long before deployment)
18	immersed with others or by self
18	cultural aspect of immersion is important
10	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
29	other

Table 56. Mission Challenges, Active Units

Frequency	*that contribute to a lack of preparation*
3	missions in many locations
12	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
9	other

Table 57. Tools for Language Preparation, Active Units

Frequency	*tools to use in training/preparation*
6	reading - to build vocabulary
4	language labs are very valuable
5	other

Table 58. Motivation for Acquiring/Maintaining Language Proficiency, Active Units

Frequency	*Why do people learn languages*
7	Current pay is not a strong motivator
3	Pride / wanting to do a better job
9	To make missions easier on themselves
8	Pay
14	other
6	*other*

Much as with overall analyses, pay was not reported as a strong motivator among Block 2 comments. However, it is unknown if persons who are motivated by FLPP simply did not choose to broach this subject.

Alternative Training Techniques

Table 59. Possible Alternative Training Techniques, Active Units

Frequency	*possible alternatives to traditional training*
2	pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
3	tutoring in specific languages
10	immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site
26	other

As detailed in the overall analyses results, there were a large number of suggestions for different ways to approach foreign language training. Many of these defied categorization, even after reviewing all "other" comments to look for consistencies among comments.

Table 60. The Role of DL and TDT Training, Active Units

Frequency	*Issues*
4	immersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks.
4	DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them
2	other
	would DL, TDT solutions be effective
1	maybe a little
3	yes, anything helps
1	other
	other comments about DL, TDT
2	other

Issues in Proficiency Assessment

Table 61. Issues in Proficiency Assessment, Active Units

Frequency	*DLPT*
2	Needs to be less military specific
6	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
2	is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
24	needs improvement
7	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
18	other
8	is not a valid measure of usage in the field
	On the need for speaking to be assessed
26	Needs to incorporate speaking into DLPT some way / Use OPI
7	other comments
	OPI
8	Is a good test
1	Is too subjective
5	other comments
1	Other

As reflected in the overall summary analyses, active duty personnel indicated many problems with the DLPT.

Issues with Specific Programs

Often discussion turned to specific training programs. These comments are more fully evaluated in the results by SOF type section of this document as experiences varied considerably.

Table 62. Issues with Specific Training Programs, Active Units

Frequency	*DLI Arabic program*
1	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
1	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
1	other comments
	DLI courses in general
8	Need a greater speaking focus
18	Spend too much time teaching specifically for DLPT
12	other comments
	Berlitz
8	other comments

Frequency	DLI Arabic program
	SWC
4	Not enough focus on military language
3	Not long enough
11	other comments
	other programs
12	other comments

Question Block 3

Language Competency Priorities

Table 63. Language Skill Proficiency Top Priorities, Active Units

Frequency	#1 priority
28	speaking
12	listening
1	writing
	reading
3	other

Table 64. Language Skill Proficiency Secondary Priorities, Active Units

Frequency	#2 priority
1	speaking
11	listening
	writing
2	reading
1	other

As before, speaking and listening skills were considered far more valuable than other types of foreign language proficiency.

Table 65. Level of Proficiency Needed, Active Units

Frequency	what proficiency levels are needed
4	1-1
8	2-2
6	3-3
4	can have a variety within a given unit
12	other

Initial Acquisition

Classroom Training

Most comments advocated language training either early or toward the end of the training pipeline, though some indicated completing all other training and spending time with the unit before language training should begin.

Table 66. Most Appropriate Training Sequence, Active Units

Frequency	*when in pipeline?*
10	early - as part of some of the first training that occurs
13	late but before being sent to unit - just before send off to unit
8	very late - after sent to unit (to prevent burnout)
4	other

Table 67. Emphasis of Language Training, Active Units

Frequency	*primary emphasis should be?*
8	military language
6	street language
3	equal mix
2	other

There were mixed recommendations regarding emphasis.

Maintenance/Refresher Training

Table 68. Language Maintenance/Refresher Training Techniques, Active Units

Frequency	*type?*
9	language lab
4	DL
1	college classes
31	immersion
10	classroom (DLI, etc.)
10	language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)
10	other

Most comments indicated that immersion training was most useful for refresher training, though many persons realized that such training is not always an option due to constraints.

Table 69. Interval of Maintenance/Refresher Training, Active Units

Frequency	*how often?*
5	weekly
3	monthly
11	other
8	annually

Table 70. Issues in Maintenance Training, Active Units

Frequency	*issues in maintenance*
1	should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
2	other

Table 71. Best Training Techniques, Active Units

Frequency	*for initial acquisition*
10	classroom
14	classroom/immersion combo
7	other
	for sustaining/enhancing
13	immersion
13	other

Table 72. Mandatory or Voluntary Training Opinions, Active Units

Frequency	*Should training be voluntary or involuntary*
19	mandatory for all
1	voluntary
4	based on aptitude/interest
15	basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
5	other

Most comments advocated at least some mandatory language training for everyone.

Barriers to Language Acquisition and Maintenance

Table 73. Barriers to Language Acquisition and Maintenance, Active Units

Frequency	*What are these barriers?*
20	financial costs of training
47	no time for dedicated long period of language training
11	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
5	no language lab

19	low priority for leadership
4	time not being used efficiently
21	other
10	other lack of resources
1	lack of awareness of resources
4	no structured program/maintenance

In a common trend, time constraints were considered the primary obstacle to foreign language proficiency.

Table 74. Ways to Remove Barriers to Language Acquisition and Maintenance, Active Units

Frequency	*How can they be removed?*
4	discretionary language funds for units
16	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
2	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
5	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
16	other

Increasing Motivation

Table 75. Ways to Increase Language Acquisition and Maintenance Motivation, Active Units

Frequency	*pay*
9	pay based on language difficulty
5	no cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated
3	pay separately for proficiency in speaking than in listening/reading comprehension
3	pay based on the number of years you have maintained proficiency
7	more pay using current compensation system
5	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
24	other
	practical use
3	make sure they will be used in the field
3	other
	recognition
2	any type
	other
8	try and select those with prior language exposure
18	other
4	hold people accountable

Most comments regarding motivation to learn language were difficult to classify, though many related to altering the compensation system, FLPP.

Potential Improvements

Table 76. Specific Ways to Improve Training, Active Units

Frequency	Ways to improve training
1	instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
2	allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
4	SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
4	Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
2	Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
1	Keep class size small (under 10)
6	other comments
1	Make proficiency a requirement to be eligible to deploy
1	Actually practice training sessions (they will be done down-range) in the native language stateside
4	CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
1	Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
10	other comments
3	Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
3	Immersion training is best

Given the mixed assortment of comments presented above, summaries are provided by each SOF type rather than across all active or reserve units. Experiences and comments across all active units were so diverse that a much more accurate picture of data trends is available by examining analyses by SOF type.

Reserve/National Guard Units

Question Block 1

Situational Description

Of the few comments on the topic, most reservists were engaged in missions rather than training (as compared to many active duty personnel).

Table 77. Tasks Performed, Reserve Units

Frequency	Tasks performed?
1	Training others
8	Missions
1	other

Language needs were mixed, however for reserve groups.

Table 78. Language Specificity, Reserve Units

Frequency	Which language was required of the mission:
3	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
7	National language
4	Specific local dialect
	other

Table 79. Importance of Proficiency Required, Reserve Units

Frequency	Level of proficiency required on the mission
3	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases - listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
5	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
2	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful
2	other
	How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?
1	A moderate amount
3	A lot

Table 80. Nature of Vocabulary Required, Reserve Units

Frequency	Proficiencies needed?
12	General language (around town)
6	Technical-job related or military terms

Again, speaking and listening were most important.

Table 81. Proficiency Importance, Reserve Units

Frequency	Which is more important?
7	Speaking
3	Reading
4	Writing
7	Listening
	other

Table 82. Cultural Importance, Reserve Units

Frequency	How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?
2	Helpful but not essential
7	Essential
1	other

Table 83. Prevalence of English Speakers, Reserve Units

Frequency	Do the natives typically speak English
2	Some of them
2	Few of them
1	None of them

Use of Job Aides

Interpreters

Table 84. Frequency of Interpreter Usage, Reserve Units

Frequency	How often
4	yes - local interpreters, frequently
1	yes - local interpreters, infrequently
3	yes - military provided interpreters, frequently

Table 85. Importance of Interpreters to Mission, Reserve Units

Frequency	How important is it to use interpreters
6	Essential
4	Helpful

As with active personnel, reservists did use interpreters on occasion and many found them quite useful, though several issues were also discussed with regards to interpreters.

Table 86. Issues in Interpreter Selection, Reserve Units

Frequency	Issues in selecting interpreter
3	Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
1	Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
1	As long as they speak English their OK
5	Proper selection interpreters is important
3	Can't trust interpreters
	other interpreter issues

Other Job Aides

Few other comments indicated using job aids regularly.

Table 87. Use of Other Job Aides, Reserve Units

Frequency	*Note cards with phrases*
1	sometime
	always
	other
	jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal
3	on occasion
2	other

General Themes Identified

Additional Training Needs

Table 88. Additional Language Training Needs, Reserve Units

Frequency	*Additional Language Training Needs*
4	Spoken
	Written
4	Street/slang
	Formal/presentation language
4	Flexibility - broad range of skills
8	Cultural language training
3	Cultural non-verbal language training
1	Dialect Training
1	Immersion training
5	More time in formal classes
5	Other

Most reservists (like active duty personnel not engaged in training missions) indicated a broader need for general, not military specific, language training.

Benefits of language proficiency

Table 89. Benefits of Language Proficiency, Reserve Units

Frequency	*Basic*
7	Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
2	Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
4	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	More advanced
3	Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
3	Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
	Unspecified
9	Builds rapport/trust
6	Enhances communication effectiveness
1	Increases efficiency/speed of mission
3	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
5	Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
1	Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)

Consequences of a Lack of Proficiency

Table 90. Consequences of a Lack of Language Proficiency, Reserve Units

Frequency	*Consequences of a lack of proficiency:*
2	Can be dangerous
2	May causes mission abort/failure
5	May slow mission
3	May decrease mission effectiveness
1	May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)

Question Block 2

Issues in Training Effectiveness

Table 91. Issues in Immersion Training, Reserve Units

Frequency	*with immersion*
7	cultural aspect of immersion is important
2	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
3	other

Reservists also indicated that a benefit of immersion training is an enhanced understanding of the culture.

Table 92. Mission Challenges, Reserve Units

Frequency	*that contribute to a lack of preparation*
6	missions in many locations
3	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
1	other

Table 93. Tools for Language Preparation, Reserve Units

Frequency	*tools to use in training/preparation*
3	reading - to build vocabulary
4	language labs are very valuable
3	other

Of the few comments on the topic, reservists did not indicate that pay was a motivator for learning a language.

Table 94. Motivation for Acquiring/Maintaining Language Proficiency, Reserve Units

Frequency	*Why do people learn languages*
1	Current pay is not a strong motivator
7	Pride / wanting to do a better job
5	To make missions easier on themselves
2	other

Alternative Training Techniques

Table 95. Possible Alternative Training Techniques, Reserve Units

Frequency	*possible alternatives to traditional training*
1	pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
2	tutoring in specific languages
2	immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site
7	other
	Issues
1	immersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks.
1	DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them

Table 96. The Role of DL and TDT Training, Reserve Units

Frequency	*would DL, TDT solutions be effective*
7	yes, anything helps
2	other
	other comments about DL, TDT
2	Rosetta stone program is really helpful
1	other

Issues in Proficiency Assessment

Reservists also indicated problems with the DLPT and suggested incorporating speaking into a proficiency test.

Table 97. Issues in Proficiency Assessment, Reserve Units

Frequency	*DLPT*
2	Needs to be less military specific
1	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
1	is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
7	needs improvement
1	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
6	other
1	is not a valid measure of usage in the field
	On the need for speaking to be assessed
7	Needs to incorporate speaking into DLPT some way / Use OPI
1	other comments
	OPI
	Is a good test
1	Is too subjective
1	other comments
	Other

Issues with Specific Programs

Table 98. Issues with Specific Training Programs, Reserve Units

Frequency	*DLI Arabic program*
2	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
3	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
1	other comments
	DLI courses in general
1	Need a greater speaking focus
11	other comments

Question Block 3

Language Competency Priorities

Table 99. Language Skill Proficiency Top Priorities, Reserve Units

Frequency	*#1 priority*
1	speaking
3	listening
	writing
	reading
	other

Table 100. Language Skill Proficiency Secondary Priorities, Reserve Units

Frequency	*#2 priority*
1	speaking
	listening
	writing
2	reading
	other

Table 101. Level of Proficiency Needed, Reserve Units

Frequency	*what proficiency levels are needed*
2	1-1
1	2-2
	3-3
	can have a variety within a given unit
1	other

Initial Acquisition

Classroom Training

Reservists tended to indicated that training should come early. Comments to this effect indicated that extensive training efforts are just not possible given personal constraints after the initial pipeline training period.

Table 102. Most Appropriate Training Sequence, Reserve Units

Frequency	*when in pipeline?*
5	early - as part of some of the first training that occurs
2	other

Table 103. Emphasis of Language Training, Reserve Units

Frequency	*primary emphasis should be?*
1	military language
2	other

Maintenance/Refresher Training

Table 104. Language Maintenance/Refresher Training Techniques, Reserve Units

Frequency	*type?*
1	language lab
2	immersion
8	classroom (DLI, etc.)
1	language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)
2	other

For reserve groups, classroom training was the preferred method of refresher training (as prolonged immersion training is often not possible).

Table 105. Interval of Maintenance/Refresher Training, Reserve Units

Frequency	*how often?*
1	monthly
3	other
2	annually

Table 106. Issues in Maintenance Training, Reserve Units

Frequency	*issues in maintenance*
2	should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
2	other
	for initial acquisition
2	classroom/immersion combo
5	other

Table 107. Best Training Techniques, Reserve Units

Frequency	*for sustaining/enhancing*
1	immersion
3	other

Table 108. Mandatory or Voluntary Training Opinions, Reserve Units

Frequency	mandatory for all
2	voluntary
3	based on aptitude/interest
4	basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary

Barriers to Language Acquisition and Maintenance

Table 109. Barriers to Language Acquisition and Maintenance, Reserve Units

Frequency	*What are these barriers?*
1	financial costs of training
10	no time for dedicated long period of language training
1	no language lab
2	low priority for leadership
4	time not being used efficiently
4	other

Like their active duty counterparts, a lack of time to engage in training was the biggest obstacle for reservists. While active duty personnel indicated that job demands frequently interfered, reserve units tended not to indicate this as a cause (though their regular careers may in fact be a large source of lack of ability to engage in prolonged language training).

Table 110. Ways to Remove Barriers to Language Acquisition and Maintenance, Reserve Units

Frequency	*How can they be removed?*
1	discretionary language funds for units
2	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
1	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
1	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
2	other

Increasing Motivation

Table 111. Ways to Increase Language Acquisition and Maintenance Motivation, Reserve Units

Frequency	*pay*
1	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
1	other
	practical use
3	make sure they will be used in the field
	recognition
3	any type
	other
5	other

Potential Improvements

Table 112. Specific Ways to Improve Training, Reserve Unit

Frequency	instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
1	allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
1	SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
3	Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
1	Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
1	Keep class size small (under 10)
1	CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
6	other comments
4	Need to hire and retain only the best instructors

Special Issues with Reservist / National Guard

While differences between active duty and reservists for all codes do exist in some cases, some issues are specific to the reservists' situation. These are summarized in the tables below.

Table 113. Reservist Training Timing

Frequency	*Training timing*
6	should take place right after all other & basic training
6	other comments

Given constraints of reservists, several pointed to the need for language training concurrently with other training. Language training is time consuming and is likely difficult for reservists to obtain after the initial training period.

Table 114. Reservist Time Concerns

Frequency	*time concerns*
7	during drill weekends, there is no time for language drills
5	going to DLI for a year is not feasible for many/most reservists
7	other comments

Reservists made a number of comments related to time constraints or concerns. Specifically, with very limited time available on weekends, core job tasks typically take priority, which leaves almost no time for language practice/refreshing. Similar to earlier comments, attending DLI is not an option for most reservists. There were several other comments as well that are described in more detail in SOF type summaries.

Table 115. Reservists Views of Language Requirements

Frequency	*Language requirements*
3	should be required
10	there is no pre-deployment training - it should be required as well
6	other comments

Some reserve groups indicated the need for broader mandatory language training. Also, some indicated that almost no refresher language training occurs before deployment, the time that many consider to be most crucial.

Table 116. Reservist Pay Issues

Frequency	*pay issues*
6	given lack of time during drills, consider paying people to study on their own time
6	FLPP is really low for reservists
7	FLPP is not a motivator for reservists
4	better FLPP would motivate reservists to study on their own
14	other pay comments

Many comments related to FLPP for reservists. Specifically, many bemoaned the low pay, particularly in comparisons to active duty FLPP. Moreover, four comments explicitly indicated that increasing reserve FLPP would

improve motivation to learn languages. Several reservists indicated the need to study on their own. However, the low FLPP levels provides little motivation towards this end.

Table 117. Reservist Immersion Training Issues

Frequency	*immersion training*
3	there is very little opportunity for immersion in reserves, needs to be more
3	many reservists don't believe immersion is possible for them
9	other

Reservists also indicated a lack of opportunity for immersion training. While some would likely have conflicts that would prevent immersion training, others indicated a desire for this type of training. Given the positive feedback regarding the effectiveness of this type of training throughout the focus groups, increased opportunity for this type of training is important if language proficiency is desired among reservists.

Table 118. Reservist Training Option Comments

Frequency	*training options*
5	need a wide range
7	local training programs might be an option
4	very few slots for DLI and other programs are available
13	other

Several comments related to potential training options specifically for reservists. Given the particular constraints on reservists several indicated a need for a wide range of options available. Specifically options like local colleges, DL and TDT resources were mentioned.

Table 119. Reservists Support from Command

Frequency	*support from command (or higher levels)*
2	not much
2	some
6	not at all

Reservists also reported particularly low levels of support for language acquisition from command. Given the constraints inherent to reservists with regards to time and available resources, a lack of support from the leadership would further reduce the likelihood of a well-trained reserve.

Summary

In sum, comments from reserve and active duty personnel were similar in many respects. While active duty personnel tended to report engaging in training missions slightly more than downrange missions, reservists reported engaging almost exclusively in downrange missions. As a result, reservists tended to indicate slightly less of a need for military specific terms than did active duty persons.

Reservists also uniformly suggested incorporating language training into the early part of the training pipeline. Reservists reported time constraints that prohibit extensive training after the initial training period. Given the relatively long time it takes to become proficient in a language, incorporating language training -early into the training pipeline is recommended. Active duty personnel were split as to where in the training pipeline language training should occur.

Given the limited time for training in the reserves, some reservists indicated that there was a generally low priority in the unit for language proficiency. These comments typically indicated that core job tasks came first. They also indicated that immersion training was either not feasible with a civilian career or that they were unaware that it was an available option for persons in the reserves. Instead, most suggested classroom training, some mentioning the potential of utilizing local colleges, for refresher language training. Several comments indicated a need for a wide variety of options for reservists trying to balance a civilian career with military duties.

Reservists also indicated that pay was not an incentive for them to acquire or maintain language skills. Given that maintenance of language is just as difficult, if not more so, for reservist as for active duty members, yet the pay is far less, these comments were not surprising.

Results by SOF Type

In this section, results are presented based on SOF type. Generally speaking, active duty and reservists are combined for these groups. However, differences between the groups are summarized in text. As stated previously, frequency tabulations of comments can at times be misleading. They can be influenced by the session moderator and can give little indication as to the importance of a particular issue. For this reason, also summarized is a summary based on a more qualitative narrative reading. These summaries were derived by reading the focus group transcript in its entirety and briefly highlighting the apparent issues. Typically these summaries will correspond closely to those of the frequency summaries. The overall conclusions derived from both a qualitative reading of the transcripts and a quantification of the content analysis is provided in each section.

Air Force (AF)

Two units comprised the AF focus groups. As described earlier, one group was comprised of Arabic speakers, while the other was a group of participants with multiple language training.

Frequency Results

Block 1

Participants responded 10 to 5 that they engage more often in downfield missions than in training missions. Only 2 of 12 reported that a specific regional dialect was needed in order to accomplish their mission. Four reported that a more general language (e.g. Standard Arabic) was needed while five reported that a more specific national language (e.g. Egyptian Arabic) was needed in order to accomplish the mission's objective.

Six of 12 comments indicated that an advanced proficiency (i.e., of at least 3-3) was needed. Three comments indicated that a proficiency of 2-2 was needed, with only two comments indicating that a 1-1 proficiency was acceptable.

Seven of 11 comments indicated that training should focus on technical language aspects (such as military terms) while four comments indicated the importance of general language skills (e.g., conversational language). An example comment is "...Unless you're fluent in Russian, and technical Russian, that technical guide is not going to be too useful to you. On the other hand, if you are then, then it can be disseminated and understand the kind of markings that the technicians are putting in there to fix the aircraft."

Thirteen of 15 comments indicated that speaking and listening were the most important language skills used.

While not numerous, some comments centered around the importance (sometimes critically) of understanding the culture within which you are working. Comments also indicated a mix of situations in which sometimes locals speak English and sometimes very few or no one speaks English. As an example "But that's also true when you're doing missions; you need to understand how these people think in order to be able to bring the message of what they're saying".

There were very few comments relating to the use of job aides such as interpreters or electronic devices. However, a small number of comments did state that interpreters can be very useful in some situations.

Also, while not numerous, some comments indicated the need for both formal language training, as one would use in talking to high level officers in another country, and for more slang language as one word use around town. Also, respondents indicated that they work in a wide variety of situations and that flexibility in their language abilities was important.

There were several comments concerning the benefits of adequate language training. These are tabulated in the table below.

Table 120. Benefits of Adequate Language Training Results for AF Focus Groups

Frequency	Benefits of Proficiency
	Basic
1	Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
1	Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
1	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	More advanced
1	Identifying important documents in another language
1	Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
1	Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
	other
	Unspecified
5	Builds rapport/trust
5	Enhances communication effectiveness
1	Increases efficiency/speed of mission
2	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
5	Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
1	Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
2	Gained information through better interpersonal relationships

As evidenced from Table 3 above, several benefits were mentioned over the course of the two focus groups. This broad category of comments seemed to be one of the more popular topics in Block 1 for the AF groups. Particularly important seems to be the enhancement of communication (and its corollary building rapport/trust). Also, increased situational awareness was seen as a real positive of being proficient in a language.

An example: "Because you build a trust right away with whoever you're working with, and right away, if you get a rapport, you'll also learn things… They're not going to tell you stuff in English, but I picked up on in Polish …", and another: "...we were probably about 40 km from Jerusalem when the Al Aqusa intifada started and there was just total chaos in that area. And that's when a lot of things started happening. You could hear things on the streets, anti-American rhetoric was being said. Anti-American banners were being posted, even around where we were at, they were just right outside the areas. It let you know what the sentiment of the local populous is right at that point in time. "

Several negative effects of a lack of proficiency were also mentioned. The table below includes frequency data for these categories.

Table 121. Issues Arising from a Lack of Adequate Language Training Results for AF Focus Groups

Frequency	*Consequences of a lack of proficiency:*
3	Can be dangerous
2	May causes mission abort/failure
2	May slow mission
3	May decrease mission effectiveness

The possibility of a dangerous situation, while not a frequent occurrence, is certainly important to consider. More frequently reported was the danger of an ineffective, slow, or aborted mission. These groups sensed both advantages of language proficiency and the dangers of not being proficient.

The full tabulated code sheet for the AF Block 1 comments is available in Appendix E.

Block 2

In general, most comments seemed to center around proficiency assessment and immersion training for those classified as Block 2 comments. Keep in mind however, that several comments made during the second question block were coded using the Block 3 coding scheme.

Specifically, with respect immersion training issues, five comments dealt explicitly with how much cultural information is gained via immersion training. As an example comment: "I think of any other thing that you did with immersion that you don't get anywhere is the cultural experience, and that's worth a lot. "

Two additional comments indicated that immersion training should be more widely available, specifically to persons with lower than 3-3- proficiency. One additional comment related to the effectiveness of immersion training because of the dedicated time to study during that period.

Two comments indicated the importance and benefits of language labs for maintaining language proficiency.

Two comments indicated that pay is not a strong motivator in acquiring and maintaining language proficiency. Two additional comments imply that personal pride and wanting to do a good job are stronger motivators for being proficient. An example comment: "I'm supposed to be the number one Arabic speaker in the unit and if I can't get up in front of my Arab counterparts and give a speech in Arabic, a thank you speech, I don't feel like I'm doing my part, pulling my weight on that team."

Four comments centered on the limitations of DL or TDT administered training. As with most groups, these solutions might be effective for some maintenance of capabilities, but not likely for initial language acquisition.

Comments related to the DLPT were quite varied. There was one comment each for stating that the DLPT needs to focus more on military specific language and that the DLPT needs to be geared towards more general language usage. Two comments indicated that the DLPT was an adequate measure while two others indicated that general (non-specified) improvement was needed. One other comment indicate that the DLPT was not consistent with how language is used in the field. Other comments related to proficiency assessment were varied (e.g., discussing the difficulties of assessing speaking in a standardized way).

The full tabulated code sheet for the AF Block 2 comments is available in Appendix F.

Block 3

In Block 3, participants indicated that speaking and listening skills were overwhelmingly the most important (9 comments out of 10 indicated the importance of these skills). Opinions were mixed as to when in the training sequence language training should occur. The table below provides frequency results for suggestions on best sustaining/refreshing language skills:

Table 122. Suggestions for Maintaining Language Skills, AF Focus Groups

Frequency	Maintenance/Refresher
	Training type?
1	language lab
1	DL
	college classes
4	immersion
3	classroom (DLI, etc.)
	language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)
1	other
	how often?
2	weekly
1	monthly
	other
4	annually

As can be seen in Table 5, respondents preferred immersion and classroom training for refresher/maintenance training, though some respondents see the utility of language labs and DL for these purposes. Frequency of maintenance/refresher training varied as well. Though not tabulated, immersion training was recommended for longer intervals between training sessions than was language lab and DL training methods. An example comment: "...coming out of basic training or out of college or an academy, it would be nice if we could get the guys a good basis course, you know, a six-month course, that type of thing, and then yearly immersions, refresher training;"

Similar results are found when looking at other categories regarding the importance of training types for initial acquisition. Nearly everyone (5 of 6 comments) agrees that immersion training is the most effective, though typically some classroom training is required first in order to master the basics of the language.

All three comments on the topic indicated that language training should be mandatory for everyone in their unit.

Tabulations of barriers to language acquisition/maintenance are listed in the table below.

Table 123. Barriers to Language Acquisition/Maintenance, AF Focus Groups

Frequency	Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities
	What are these barriers?
7	financial costs of training
8	no time for dedicated long period of language training
3	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
3	other
1	other lack of resources
	How can they be removed?
1	discretionary language funds for units
3	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
1	other

As seen in Table 6, financial and time constraints toped the list of barrier to effectiveness. An example comments is: "It's because of the span of time that they're out-of-pocket. For one, the unit is minus that person, which is probably the biggest one—now you're losing a body for that amount of time.". Though frequency counts are similar for financial costs and time constraints, a more narrative read suggests that time is the bigger constraints.

As far as things that can be done to remove these barriers, the most common related to ensuring that personnel has adequate time away from other tasks to get the required language training.

There were not a large amount of comments relating to how to improve motivation for acquiring a language. Only two comments related to increased pay, while others included making sure persons had a chance to use trained skills on the job. An example comment is: "...make sure that the language that the guys are being trained are the ones that are going out and using". There were four additional comments that did not fit into the coding scheme. For example, "you hire the guys who have already had some language, so you know they've got some prior language, and so they've got some kind of capacity for learning a language".

With respect to ways to improve training, two comments were geared at hiring appropriate instructors. For example, "The qualification of their instructors is a huge problem." Other comments were varied, such as "what I think would help, is just to have an instructor here all the time."

The full tabulated code sheet for the AF Block 3 comments is available in Appendix G.

Narrative Reading

Block 1 (Combined focus groups)

The overall theme from this block group is that language skills are important in a variety of situations and for many different purposes. There were several comments suggesting that listening skills and understanding other languages were especially important. Also, there were many comments about the diversity of languages that it would be useful to know because many places where these individuals were assigned were in territories where multiple languages were spoken. There were many comments about the importance of knowing specific technical terms as well as knowing more common terms in order to communicate information and understand information being communicated. Another common theme was that many people suggested that even without appropriate training or skills in a particular language that they were able to achieve a certain level of communication with a little effort (asking locals, asking for help from others).

Rapport building was also a common theme as it helps build credibility and shows respect. With increased rapport, respondents indicated that the mission can be accomplished without rapport, but not as smoothly or as well. One group also emphasized that low-ranking officers, need language training because they're the ones who come in contact with the low-ranking local soldiers who are the ones who don't speak much English. Another concern in both groups was that AF members were afraid that the language skills they do have are/will not be utilized properly

Block 2

The main points addressed in this block were that language training is a must before entering the unit, which was mentioned multiple times. Immersion training was also seen to be highly valuable, but only after some classroom training. A general consensus among the group was that there should be more required hours of language training, because what they require now is not sufficient. A few commented on the risk you run by having a member not know enough of the language before going on a mission, such as the potential for death or serious injury. Lastly, motivating factors included more money for the languages, but pride was a strong motivator as well.

Additionally, there was a fair amount of specific discussion of the DLI Arabic program. Specifically, some members felt strongly that the program had a low information return for the large amount of time required to complete the program. Specific criticisms include too much emphasis on reading, not enough on speaking.
This group also suggested using of immersion as an incentive; the importance of speaking and listening skills, and issues with the DLPT.

Block 3

While there were many comments in this block, the thing stressed most often was that both focus groups indicated that initial training should be conducted prior to joining the unit because once with the unit, there's less time to devote to training.

Conclusions

For AF members, language training is never likely to be the top priority. While clearly AF members see the importance of language proficiency, other tasks take precedent in their training. As a result, language training (including some immersion) should come before going to the unit. Comments suggested that training be mandatory for everyone, though in Block 3, one group indicated that the highest levels of proficiency would be needed by relatively few unit members.

The language training needs to be shorter than the DLI Arabic program for AF members. Any language training should focus particularly on speaking and listening skills with a mixture of technical language and street language.

One idea brought forth by the group was using immersion training as a reward.

Army Special Forces (SF)

Six units comprised the active duty SF focus groups, with two additional reserve units. Languages with which the groups were proficient varied considerably.

Frequency Results

Block 1

Fourteen of nineteen comments indicate that active SF personnel are involved primarily in training duties (such as training military personnel in other countries), with the rest involved with other types of missions. The sample was evenly split as to whether a local dialect was needed (13 comments) or if a more global language (e.g., Spanish) was sufficient in order to be effective (13 comments). Stated proficiency requirements also varied from 1-1 (4

comments), 2-2 (4 comments), to 3-3 (2 comments). Similar, though less frequent results were reported for reserve units.

Few comments related to how important was fluency compared to minimal proficiency, but those comments on the subject seemed to suggest that lower levels of proficiency were required.

Comments for active units were also split on the emphasis that should be placed on more technical military language training (7 comments) verses more general language (6 comments). Example comments include: "We need to learn a street-level Arabic for whatever countries you're going into." and "...<knowledge of how to get around town> that doesn't help me in Iraq, in Southern Iraq, where I'm trying to teach the guy military things or talking about military things.". Two comments indicated a need for increased emphasis of technical language for reserve units.

Eighteen comments indicated that speaking was the most important type of proficiency, while ten indicated that listening was most important.

There were few comments about the importance of understanding the culture of the environment in which you are working.

There were a fair number of comments dealing with using interpreters. Seven comments indicated that frequent use of military provided interpreters (e.g., other personnel from the unit or other units), four related to frequently using local interpreters. Two more comments indicated some infrequent use of both local and military interpreters. Of the eight comments regarding the usefulness of interpreters, seven indicated that they were an essential resource. An example comment is: "talk over there is so quick, I mean, you can't really interpret what you really need to. Sure you know how to say stop and put your hands up, but to actually have a conversation, that takes years."

Nine comments warned of the dangers of choosing the wrong interpreter. Example comments include: "The interpreter wasn't really saying the things we were supposed to be saying, and he shot a person with his... <transcription missing".

With respect to additional training needs or areas of training focus, a large number (12) indicated the need for street slang or language as it is used by locals. An example comment: "The normal soldiers, they're very often uneducated and they will speak a very, very basic colloquial dialect."

Six comments point to the need for some cultural training before going into the field. For example: "If you want to ask some cultural questions—they are just important things that you should be learning from your language instructor at SWC. Is your first name unique to you, then your second name is your father's name, and then your third name is your grandfather's name? Should we learn this stuff? Why don't they wear wedding rings—bands if they are married? Well, no Muslims don't usually wear jewelry. They need to be finding that stuff out, because that is their first exposure to this culture that they are going to be __ and working in."

Along a similar line, the importance of immersion training was indicated in seven comments. These comments tended to also point to the importance of learning a language as it is actually spoken and learning the cultural aspects of the areas. One example comment: "Send them to immersion, versus sending them to CLP, because we're learning from the teachers here, and they teach us the formal languages out of the book. It's just not… That's not what is spoken there."

Frequency counts for the benefits of proficiency are given in the table below.

Table 124. Benefits of language proficiency, SF Focus Groups

Frequency	Benefits of proficiency:
	Basic
2	Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
5	Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
5	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	More advanced
2	Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
1	other
	Unspecified
18	Builds rapport/trust
4	Enhances communication effectiveness
3	Increases efficiency/speed of mission
3	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
1	Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
2	Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
1	other

Several clear examples are available to illustrate some benefits of language training. For example: "A man came walking out the compound and didn't know that we were there. With what I've learned from the interpreter, I was able to immediately tell him to put his hands up and get up and be quite and stay where you are." Illustrates the importance of even basic proficiency.

As the examples above indicate, there can be dire consequences of not being proficient in a language during conflict situations. Although less critical, comments like "Yeah, you can throw in a few words in there, that's great. And also the rapport, I don't know how many times that just because you're trying to speak their language, it's a great rapport building" illustrate the real advantages of having some knowledge of a language. Although not explicitly coded, most comments indicated that building rapport or trust was essential in making a mission go more smoothly.

Consequences of a lack of proficiency were also mentioned. Five comments indicated that such a lack could be dangerous (e.g., "you better understand what you're hearing outside, host nation voices, if they're saying whereabouts, 'let's go hit him with an RPG,' it would be something that I want to know").

Twelve others indicated a possible lack of mission effectiveness. For example: "The last place we went, I had an interpreter with me and then another guy with another group of snipers. Because of the way the communications were set up, we didn't have anybody at each position speaking the language. One position is talking back to their commander, and the whole operations ended up kicking off earlier than it ever should have."

Six additional comments indicated that a mission may be slowed by a lack of language abilities. For example: "It just made for longer days. We couldn't teach as much as we had planned during that session, because it just took longer to get the point across to them."

Notably, there were 30 other comments that were not easily categorized.

The full tabulated code sheet for the active SF Block 1 comments is available in Appendix H, while those of reserve units appear in Appendix I.

Block 2

Much of the comments categorized as Block 2 dealt with proficiency assessment. This issue was discussed in some detail by several groups. Other discussion topics include specific issues in immersion training, possible alternatives to traditional training methods, and reasons SF soldiers acquire language skills.

A total of 27 comments were categorized as being relevant to issues in immersion training. However, many of these defied consistent categorization. Some dealt with timing issues (e.g., "So it doesn't have to be added on so they take the guy away for four months. Send him—four months before he goes, send him for a month."), others related to the general administration of immersion programs, (e.g., "I think there should be a little more effort put towards getting people into immersion"), while others still dealt with why immersion is effective (e.g., "In the States you're always going to have distracters. So we're right here—somebody will be speaking English. You've got to be in that country to be totally immersed, and nothing but that language.") While there is a information related to immersion training in Block 2 of the focus groups, the structure of the session was loose enough that comments were quite varied on this topic. Six in the reserve group pointed explicitly to the importance of the cultural aspects of immersion training.

Three comments related to the interference that core job tasks have with the ability to acquire language skills (a topic covered further in Block 3).

Two comments indicated that people learn languages in order to make missions easier on themselves (rather than for financial reasons).

There were several varied suggestions for alternative approaches to language training. Of the 18 comments, 5 suggested having an "immersion" training experience within the US. One sample comment helps to further explain this suggestion: "I know they can't send me to Afghanistan to be immersed... but I'm saying if that's my language, find a U.S. citizen who speaks Pashtun and you pay him to have two team guys go live with him for a month and speak nothing but Pashtun." Other suggestions include "immersion in a host nation army", having dedicated days/times within a unit that everyone must speak a different language, practicing running a range state-side entirely in the language, and similar suggestions.

Again, conversation did not center on DL and TDT training techniques. However, three comments indicated that these methods may be effective if dedicated time was allowed to pursue study of them. Two other comments indicated that any resource, including DL and TDT would be useful in language maintenance. In general, comments regarding DL and TDT were not overly negative, however, they did not generate much enthusiasm amongst focus group members.

There were many comments with respect to proficiency assessment. The table below includes frequency data for the specific categories covered with regards to proficiency assessment.

Table 125. Issues in Proficiency Assessment, SF Focus Groups

Frequency	Issues in proficiency assessment
	DLPT
2	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
14	needs improvement
4	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
10	other
2	is not a valid measure of usage in the field
	On the need for speaking to be assessed
13	Needs to incorporate speaking into DLPT some way / Use OPI
2	other comments

Frequency	Issues in proficiency assessment
	OPI
2	Is a good test
3	other comments
	Other

As indicated in Table 8 above, there were a number of comments that were negative in nature regarding the DLPT that were not specific enough to categorize. Example comments include, "I never tested below a 2+ in French reading and listening. That doesn't really help if you want to get into a country... actually having a conversation with somebody is a little different.", and "I think the DLPTs are all wrong. It's not even close."

These criticisms are sparked by the inherent importance of speaking for SF soldiers, yet these skills are not tested by the DLPT. Thirteen comments mention the need to incorporate speaking explicitly. Several other comments imply this need (yet were categorized as with "needs improvement" or "other"). Clearly, this is an issue considered important to these focus groups.

There were also several comments related to specific courses offered either through DLI or SWC. These comments related to several issues such as training specifically to take the DLPT, courses not geared towards speaking. Other comments such as: "Well, my opinion is the SWC language program is a good thing for a country you are actually going to go into. But like us, we don't know when the heck we are going to go" relate to the timing of training.

Another valid but infrequent comment includes issues concerning the need for SOF specific tests and standards: "Why are we trying to take this test with the guys who go to DLI for a year and a half or two years, taking the same thing? We are only here for four to six months. We've got to get away from that DLPT. SOF needs to develop its own testing standards, away from the regular army."

There were some special issues with reservists that were identified and categorized as part of the Block 2 categories. Specifically, one comment indicated that with so little time on drill weekends, there is no time for language training. Other comments decried the low FLPP for reservists. In general though, there were fewer issues specific to reservists for the SF groups than some other groups.

The full tabulated code sheet for the SF Block 2 comments is available in Appendix J. Those of reserve units appear in Appendix K.

Block 3

Overwhelmingly, respondents indicated that speaking and listening were the most important proficiencies required of them. Reading was next most important, though it was a distant third place.

Opinions were quite mixed as to where in the training pipeline language training should occur. Six comments (three from reservists) implied that language should be part of the first training in the pipeline. Three comments (one from reservists) implied that language training should occur near the end of the pipeline (before going to unit). Four comments indicated that training should happen after going to the unit (in order to prevent burn-out from overtraining).

Opinions were also rather evenly split regarding the need for military specific (4 comments) training verses general language training (4 comments). Three additional comments indicated a need for a mix of these.

Thirteen comments indicated that immersion training was the best method of refresher/maintenance training, five comments indicated that additional classroom training would best fulfill this need. Five others indicated that having dedicated days/times in which only certain languages could be spoken would be useful. Other suggestions included using language labs, college courses, and DL methods.

Frequency of refresher/maintenance training tended to defy convenient categorization. This is in part because of the varied methods of training suggested for this purpose.

Regarding whether training should be required, ten comments suggested that training should be mandatory for all, three suggested that training should be based on aptitude or interest, with six comments suggesting that basic training should be required for all with more advanced training for only those able and interested.

Barriers to language development and maintenance are given in the table below.

Table 126. Barriers to Language Development/Maintenance, SF Focus Groups

Frequency	Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities
	What are these barriers?
5	financial costs of training
27	no time for dedicated long period of language training
6	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
9	low priority for leadership
2	time not being used efficiently
11	other
4	other lack of resources

As can be seen in Table 9, time constraints were most frequently reported. Example comments include: "So it's not really a motivation issue, it's the fact that you've got literally 20 things to do and you know, the language is like 18 or 19 on the list.". Other similar comments indicate that there isn't time for adequate immersion or language acquisition training. Reservists were particularly sensitive to the lack of time. Reservists contributed 8 of 27 comments in this category above.

Six comments suggest that leaders making sure that time is available for training would help to overcome these obstacles. Two comments suggest that better facilities would help as well. Two other comments indicate that including maintenance plans in annual developmental planning and performance review would also help. Eight other comments were classified as "other".

The full tabulated code sheet for the SF Block 3 comments is available in Appendix L. Reserve unit sheets appear in Appendix M.

Narrative summary

ACSF1 Block 1:
Most of the individuals in this group relied on translators for their language needs. The translators work reasonably well when they are screened and trustworthy. Proficiency would be great, but there seems to be little time and resources to do this so they get by with translators and physical/gesture communication. Some have had pre-deployment training, but more would be helpful in order to learn this basics of the language. This would help them gain more credibility with the locals. The different dialects make translation hard. More training with street/slang and immersion were emphasized the most. PowerPoint was the only technology used. Even though the individuals are not language proficient they get by and make the mission succeed.

ACSF1 Block 2:
The major focus of this group was the need for more operationally-based language training so they need more training in military terms and slang terms. Their current language training is too formal for many of the people they will be working with. They all agreed that immersion is the most effective training and that any level can benefit from it. They recommended doing week-long, half-day refresher courses before they start a mission so they can be more prepared to speak once they get to the country. One suggestion was to go over to the country 3 weeks early to refresh their language skills and to meet with their interpreter and go over the training materials. This method allows them to revamp their training course so that it can be more effectively communicated. The DL and TDT were not often utilized, but they agreed that it suffered from many of the same weaknesses as formal classroom training (too formal, not enough slang or military language, mediocre instructors). CDs were not a great training tool because they had little time to use them. Their suggestions are more immersion and more military and slang language.

ACSF1 Block 3:
There was a lot of talk in this group about designing language training to cover the basics (grammar, alphabet, few key phrases) of all, or at least most, of the languages in a particular theater that would be taught prior to deployment. Most of the people in this group seemed to agree that the language training needs to include more military specific terminology, have the language training as it was needed (e.g., learn Korean before going to Korea), and that resources for several languages were lacking. Also, they did not like the DLPT and prefer the OPI test instead.

10th SFG Block 1:
According to participants in this block, their language training needs encompass basic language skills such as the ability to read road signs. Often times, they have utilized interpreters to understand the natives, but they must be cautious about the interpreters' intentions and trustworthiness. Ideally, each team would have a soldier with a high skill level (perhaps 3-3) to be able to teach other members of the team the language that is relevant to the particular country. Regarding the DLPT and OPI, several participants felt that the OPI was more job-relevant and more useful examination than the DLPT for additional reasons. Further, the participants suggested that the DLPT does not adequately assess their skill levels and is only administered as a "check-off" for military leadership. Regarding training type, participants agreed that immersion is an effective training medium and should perhaps be offered as a motivator for foreign language proficiency because current pay is not a motivator.

10th SFG Block 2:
According to participants in this block, speaking and listening are the most important skills. Further, personnel should receive a minimum of one refresher course per year. This group of participants spoke extensively about completing training and evaluating proficiency at the team-level. In doing so, they believe that training time and resources will be focused on learning a few core languages and further, the team will be more empowered to teach one another and train themselves.

ACSF10 Block 1:
Similar to other groups mentioned above, listening and speaking are the most important communication skills identified by this group. Building rapport was one commonly mentioned benefit of language proficiency with this group. The group also suggested that universal languages should be taught and built upon.

ACSF10 Block 2:
This group felt strongly that the DLPT needs to be revamped - it is outdated and not always relevant. In addition, they felt that speaking should be tested. Some group members suggested that language training should come after team assignment to prevent burnout and increase motivation. They also recommended that language compensation should be changed to account for varying language difficulties and for speaking skills.

ACSF10 Block 3:
This group also indicated that peaking and listening are more important and useful than reading, particular conversational skills are the most important. This group also indicated that speaking should be assessed to determine proficiency. The group stated that immersion should be voluntary because people who aren't interested in improving their language skills won't benefit as much. Other DLPT criticism include that it is an outdated test. The group felt that conversational level of proficiency should be required and mentioned that the compensation system should be revamped.

ACSF3 Block 1:
For this group, interpreters are essential but there are issues (e.g. trust, English proficiency) that exist. Like other groups, this group indicated that the DLPT needs improvement - questions are not relevant to the missions. Also, actually language used on mission is not sometimes not tested. This group also indicated that speaking and listening are the most important skills.

ACSF3 Block 2:
This group also stated that immersion is the best way to learn a language and suggested that classroom training be combined with immersion training. He group felt that language training should come later in the pipeline - the most they should get before going to a team is the basics. This group also criticized the DLPT.

ACSF3 Block 3:
This focus group emphasized the importance of immersion training for initial language acquisition and also for maintenance of language skills. The suggestions seemed to favor current methods of classroom training, but with slight modifications and extensions to make classroom training more useful and valuable. For example, one group suggested breaking up classroom training into two courses, a basic course and a more advanced course. Another suggestion was to make sure resources were available for self-education opportunities by providing pamphlets and other reading materials that individuals could carry with them.

ACSF5 Block 1:
This group generally doesn't like using a translator because of the potential for missed opportunities and also don't necessarily trust them. Also, they think that language proficiency tests should be geared more to what the SF does and focus more on street level language (particularly for Arabic). Also, this is reflected in this groups expressed interest in more street level and dialect languages being taught in courses. This group seems to believe that most of the street/dialect training is received either through immersion or on the job. Most of the group seemed to feel that their current language proficiency is good at building rapport only.

ACSF5 Block 2:
This group said a very wide variety of things during this session. They proposed several training programs and timelines. One theme that was fairly constant in the transcript was that SF should be held to a different standard then the rest of the military. They all seem to think that the training towards passing the DLPT is a waste of time and money and that SF should have it's own basic language school with more advanced training available to those the aptitude/interest

ACSF5 Block 3:
This focus group seemed to focus on a problem they perceive with the current DLPT testing methods. They perception is that the military is interested in getting individuals to pass the DLPT exam, but there is a lack of focus on getting individuals to actually be able to speak the language and communicate in actual situations. The groups seemed to want the language program to be directed at more concrete goals directly related to the missions in which they will be involved. Comments were made about how an individual should be trained in a particular language based on where they will most likely be deployed. The groups placed emphasis on both speaking and listening skills. A lot of emphasis was placed on being able to practically apply and use the language skills taught in actual military situations. Also, most of the groups did not believe that distance learning was a feasible as a primary learning tool. However, one comment was made that study tools (computer software, foreign news stations) would be very valuable if made available in the team rooms.

ACSF7 Block 1:
There were many comments in this focus group that were not able to be coded because of poor transcription and missing information in the statements. There was emphasis placed on the importance of being able to speak with individuals at all different ranks or levels in host nations. Additionally there was emphasis placed on the importance of attempting to speak the language of the host nation for building rapport or gaining respect even if an individual's language skills were not very good. The participants in the focus group indicated that there were many situations in which they had to improvise or use limited language skills to communicate, but that they were able to "get by" in most situations in which they found themselves. Different individuals placed emphasis on reading, writing, listening, and speaking emphasizing that one is more important than the others depending upon the situation. Speaking typically precedes reading and writing, but higher ranking individuals must be able to read and write reports, and

when in dangerous situations it is important to listen to what is being said to avoid danger. So, each of these language capabilities is important depending upon the situation.

ACSF7 Block 2:
This group experienced frustration due to the disconnect between testing and teaching methods of the languages they are learning and the actual application of what they are learning. These individuals believe that they are being tested on their ability to listen and read, but that the real focus should be on their ability to speak. Also, the major barrier that was identified regarding becoming proficient in a language was time constraints. These individuals believe that they are not given enough time to effectively learn needed languages. Many suggestions were made about how to incorporate different resources into daily activities in order to eliminate this barrier. For example, having the news on in a foreign language in the team rooms or providing newspapers in the foreign language in the workplace. Dissatisfaction regarding the current incentive pay for foreign language proficiency was also expressed.

ACSF7 Block 3:
This group believes that speaking and listening are more important than reading or writing when dealing with language proficiency. However, they do stress that reading and writing are important if you are higher up in the ranks. Language training should be flexible and should be integrated into other military training. Materials like foreign TV/newspapers/movies should be made available to teams since this is cheaper than sending people to a country for immersion. Send people who are in the early stages of language training to Spanish-speaking communities or communities that speak the language they are learning.

Reserve units:

RCSF20 Block 1:
Essentially what was discussed in this block was the importance of having basic language skills, the dangers of choosing the wrong interpreters, and the most important language skills to have on missions. Most of the discussion indicated how important it is to just have the basic skills of a particular language. Typically, only a 1-1 is required to get a person through most missions. Anything more than that is great, but a 1-1 will do for basic navigation, building trust, and discerning whether an interpreter is leaving out details, or giving more details than they should. The big problems with the native interpreters is that a lot of times they cannot be trusted. It can be a danger to a mission to lack proficiency skills, in the ways of choosing the wrong interpreter, slowing down missions, or making them less effective. Lastly, a consensus was reached that speaking and listening where the two most important language skills to have.

RCSF20 Block 2:
The main points emphasized in this block were how and when language training should occur. The general consensus was that they would benefit a lot more from a language if they knew where they were going to be stationed before learning a specific language. This is never the way it works, though, so it is very possible that they spend a year learning a particular language, and then get sent to a completely different place. At this point, it's not that the language they learned is a waste (because they agree that any sort of language training is very beneficial), but you aren't as able to prepare for your mission, and communicate. Immersion is another technique they believe is very effective; and any level of proficiency would benefit from it. Another strong topic discussed is that the languages they learn during training should be more "informal." They discuss quite a bit how language labs and other training techniques teach them "formal" language, however, that is not how people really communicate in the native land. They believe they would benefit quite a bit more from knowing "street language" or "informal" language.

RCSF20 Block 3:
This focus group expressed the importance of speaking and listening skills as sharing #1 priority. Also, there were many comments about making language training more specific to the situation in which members of a unit will be stationed. These individuals want the language training to be geared towards the specific language spoken where the unit will be deployed. Also, several comments were made about providing distance learning materials for maintaining language skills. Since this focus group consisted of reservists special considerations arose about the compensation for proficiency and the current inequity present between reservists and individuals who are assigned to active duty.

19th SFG:

Speaking skills and listening skills were the most important to this block and more generally, basic conversation and daily functioning skills were key. Second, the participants believed that personnel should receive different levels of language training based on their seniority and leadership. Thus, training should be more aligned with career progression. Further, many of the same barriers existed for these participants that existed for participants in other blocks. For example, up-tempo, a lack of training or resources, lack of money, and a lack of time were barriers to language skill learning. In order to remedy these barriers, participants suggested offering personnel practical incentives such as immersion or other experiential learning opportunities. Further, FLPP could be increased and personnel could receive both tuition reimbursement and/or college credit toward a degree for completing language training. Additionally, participants suggested that the resources that are available should be utilized, while access to technology-based tools and distance learning tools should be increased.

Conclusions

Primary issues for this group include the lack of time for language training. While their courses tend to be much shorter than DLI courses, they feel that they are held to a standard (the DLPT) derived for DLI participants. Much conversation revolved around perceived unfairness of the DLPT. Specifically, SF soldiers indicated that speaking and listening are by far the largest applications of language training for their units. As a result, they feel that speaking really should be incorporated into the proficiency exam in some way.

There were several innovative suggestions for alternatives to immersion training. For example, stateside "immersion" training, "immersion in a host nation army", having dedicated days/times within a unit that everyone must speak a different language, were a few that may be alternative for SF groups.

The biggest barrier associated with language acquisition/maintenance was clearly time constraints. While there is no clear remedy for this, incorporating maintenance into routine work could be beneficial.

Civil Affairs (CA)

One unit comprised the active duty CA focus groups, while three units were reservists for CA groups. Languages with which the groups were proficient varied considerably.

Frequency Results

Block 1

All eight comments from active duty CA indicated that their work primarily involved training others. This stands in contrast to the reserve groups in which eight of ten comments indicated that they primarily were involved in other types of missions.

Ten comments indicated that active CA groups found general language training to be adequate, with one comment indicating the need for a more national level language. Three comments indicated the need for specific local dialects. Among reservists, three comments stated the need for general language, seven for national languages, and four the need for specific dialects.

Level 2-2 proficiency was most commonly indicated by both active and reserve groups. Also, both groups tended to respond that proficiency was very important to mission success (though two comments among active units implied that it was not important for their situation).

The need for general language skills was indicated by 13 comments while the need for more technical language was indicated by 7 comments. Speaking was indicated as the most important proficiency by 10 comments, listening was

indicated as most important by 7 comments, with reading and writing skills being indicated as important by 3 and 4 comments, respectively.

The table below indicates the importance of cultural understanding for CA units.

Table 127. Importance of Cultural Knowledge, CA Focus Groups

Frequency	*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
3	Helpful but not essential
13	Essential
2	other

Given the job duties of these individuals, a clear understanding of the cultural aspects of location seems particularly important. An example comment as to the importance of cultural understanding is: "...I also spent time at the end of each class talking about the culture... I think that to them was very important, because, again, it's such a big difference from us."

CA personnel also indicate typically working in environments where some persons speak English.

CA personnel reported frequently using interpreters (8 comments for local interpreters, 3 for military provided interpreters), which they typically reported as being essential for mission success (9 comments). As such, they reported several issues involved with appropriate interpreter selection (see Table 11).

Table 128. Importance of Cultural Knowledge, CA Focus Groups

Frequency	*Issues in selecting interpreter*
7	Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
2	Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
1	As long as they speak English their OK
7	Proper selection interpreters is important
3	Can't trust interpreters

Sample comments include: "I had an interpreter that when I negotiate by __ services, he would raise the prices instead of trying to get the lower price.", and "...we had a native speaker who was sitting among the other soldiers. He didn't want to say that he spoke the language yet... So, we laid on the interpreter, and the interpreter came in and interpreted for us. The guy is shaking his head and saying, 'That isn't even close.'"

Several additional training needs were indicated by the CA focus groups. For example, spoken language (4 comments), street usage (5 comments), flexibility in language skills (5 comments), cultural training (13 comments), the need for more formal courses (5 comments), and other comments (8 comments). Other comments included topics such as the difficulty of acquiring some languages (e.g., Arabic), specific training needs would depend on the mission, and limited resources available for training.

Benefits of proficiency are given in the table below.

Table 129. Benefits of Proficiency, CA Focus Groups

Frequency	Benefits of proficiency:
	Basic
7	Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
2	Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
4	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	More advanced
	Identifying important documents in another language
3	Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
4	Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
1	other
	Unspecified
13	Builds rapport/trust
7	Enhances communication effectiveness
1	Increases efficiency/speed of mission
6	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
6	Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
1	Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
1	Gained information through better interpersonal relationships

For CA jobs, there is a lot of contact with locals in the field. Not surprisingly, these units identified building rapport or trust as the most frequent benefit of proficiency. Similar and frequent comments including showing respect. Increased awareness was also frequently mentioned as a benefit of training with a sample comment including: "...and so they were saying 'Come back, Saddam' So if we hear something like that, we might realize immediately that we're in some sort of anti-U.S. thing and we can get out of the situation or whatever.

Five comments indicated that a lack of proficiency may slow a mission, while three indicated that a dangerous situation may arise (e.g. "in Iraq right now for example, when the insurgents place a bomb, a roadside bomb, a lot of times they spray-paint on a wall or on the side of the roads, somewhere on the way up there, in Arabic, 'bomb' to warn the locals that something is there. And most Americans, you know, can't read Arabic so it's just more scribbling on the wall to them, yet if you can read the language, you know, hey, that's not right."). Five additional comments indicated that a lack of proficiency could cause mission failure or decreased mission effectiveness (e.g., "I saw a situation where some villagers really, really got upset about the quality of the treatment they were receiving. I know that part of that was because there was a lack of language skill to set things right. So, in fact, we can have a short term failure."

The full tabulated code sheet for the active CA Block 1 comments is available in Appendix N, while those of reserve units appear in Appendix O.

Block 2

As with other groups, comments coded as Block 2 comments tended to gear primarily around issues in language proficiency assessment. However, other comments are also described below.

With respect to comments relating to immersion training, two related to the importance of cultural exposure, while four were best described as "other" comments. These other comments included themes such as doing immersion training near where deployment will occur and the need for short refresher training before immersion training.

Geographic dispersion of mission locations was indicated as a limitation of training effectiveness for five comments (all from reservists). Three comments indicated that less emphasis was placed on language training than core job tasks.

One comment indicated that pay was not a strong motivator of language acquisition (while none indicated that it was a strong motivator). Two comments stated that personal pride was motivation while two other comments indicated that making a mission easier to accomplish was a motivator.

There were several suggestions for alternative types/approaches to language training. Two comments indicated the need for special tutoring, one suggested pairing novice and advanced speakers on the job, one also indicated that stateside immersion training may be an option. Four suggestions were classified as "other". Themes here included giving individual units more flexibility in the types of training that can be offered, and short-term immersion programs.

Though comments regarding DL and TDT approaches were few, they were generally positive (all comments related to DL and TDT were mentioned by reservists). Four such comments indicated that any resource helps some. As an example: "Again, over the internet, we could do a lot of these things— we could talk on the phone together, really use the technology". Similarly, three comments suggested the need for more widely available DL and TDT resources.

Issues in proficiency assessment mentioned are summarized in the table below.

Table 130. Issues in Proficiency Assessment, CA Focus Groups

Frequency	Issues in proficiency assessment
1	*DLPT*
1	Needs to be less military specific
1	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
7	needs improvement
1	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
2	other
3	is not a valid measure of usage in the field
	On the need for speaking to be assessed
9	Needs to incorporate speaking into DLPT some way / Use OPI
1	other comments
	OPI
2	Is a good test

As can be seen, seven comments were generally negative regarding the DLPT, but tended not to make specific suggestions for improvement. Nine comments related specifically for the need to incorporate speaking into the assessment in some way. These comments were more numerous from the active duty block (6 comments) than from the reserve blocks (3 comments), which is noteworthy as there were three reserve blocks and only one active block. Two comments commented on the applicability of the OPI for this purpose. Three other comments were of varied topics.

There were several comments related to specific programs. However, due to the diversity of the discussion and experiences of the CA personnel, most (11) of these did not fit into the developed coding scheme. Some of these themes include tips on instruction (after-class use of language), discussion of various training options (short mandatory courses), DLI courses too lengthy, and rotating instructors with different dialects. Of those comments more easily categorized, three criticized the Berlitz Arabic program in specific for not representing Arabic as it is used and two lamented the lack of focus on speaking ability.

The full tabulated code sheet for the active CA Block 2 comments is available in Appendix P, while those of reserve units appear in Appendix Q.

Block 3

Top priority skills were speaking and listening for both reserve and active units, though some weight was given to written language use as well (as a distant third priority).

Opinions differed between reservist and active duty troops regarding where in the training pipeline language training should occur. The active duty focus group contained three comments indicating that language training should occur after the person was in the unit in order to prevent burnout and to give some guidance as to what languages would be needed. Reservists made five comments indicating that language training should begin when all other training occurs. For this group, training opportunities after being assigned to a group are more rare. An example comment from the active duty unit: "So by the time he gets to the language training part of it, he's kind of burnt out because of the training.". From the reserve focus groups: "For me, I'd prefer to get it out of the way as soon as possible... and now that I have that out of the way early on, I'm able to <text missing>, technical aspects". There were also two other comments regarding timing from the reserve units.

The table below summarizes comments regarding options for maintenance training. Comments were equally represented for active and reserve units.

Table 131. Types of Maintenance Training, CA Focus Groups

Frequency	Maintenance Training
	type?
3	language lab
5	immersion
8	classroom (DLI, etc.)
2	language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)
2	other

Unlike some other groups, CA units indicated that classroom training (as opposed to immersion training) could be more useful for language maintenance. However, respondents also clearly identified the important role that immersion training plays as well. Three comments also centered on the role that language labs could play in maintenance of language skills.

Two comments indicated that annual maintenance/refresher training would be most appropriate while one comment suggested weekly training (for language lab training). Two other comments suggested other time frames.

The table below summarizes suggestions regarding the mandatory nature of training requirements.

Table 132. Mandatory Training Issues, CA Focus Groups

Frequency	Should training be voluntary or involuntary
5	mandatory for all
2	voluntary
3	based on aptitude/interest
4	basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
1	other

Five comments (two from active units) suggest mandatory training for all. Four additional comments suggest some mandatory training with some voluntary training for more advanced speakers. Two comments (from reservists) suggested making training voluntary.

A summary of barriers to effective language acquisition is given in Table 16.

Table 133. Barriers in Language Development and Maintenance, CA Focus Groups

Frequency	Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities
	What are these barriers?
5	financial costs of training
15	no time for dedicated long period of language training
6	no language lab
4	low priority for leadership
4	time not being used efficiently
5	other
3	other lack of resources

As with other groups, time constraint issues were particularly debilitating for CA units. Of the 15 comments to that effect, ten were made by the three reserve units. Five of the six comments indicating that a language lab was not available came from the lone active CA unit. Four comments related to an ineffective use of time. An example was, "...it was kind of just thrown on us, like, 'Hey, get ready, we're leaving', then we got to do a lot of hurry up and wait. That takes a lot of time there." Five comments were categorized as "other". Themes for these comments include a general lack of motivation as a barrier and varied locations makes for multiple language needs.

Suggestions for removing barriers were divided as well. For example, two comments related to the need for funds, two others related to the need for leadership prioritization in order to make time for training, one included the need for facilities (e.g. labs), two suggested incorporating maintenance time into annual planning, and four comments were classified as other comments.

Several comments related to the way that pay impacts motivation to acquire language skills. One comment suggested paying based on language difficulty, two suggested removing the cap on the number of language for which you can be compensated, another suggested paying based on the number of years that you have maintained proficiency, and three comments did not fit into the coding scheme. For these three comments, themes included paying based on duration of proficiency (similar to the comment above).

Ten other comments (split evenly between the one active unit and the three reserve units) suggested other motivation techniques. For example, showing the relevance of the proficiency assessment to use of language on the job, giving

participants more language options from which to choose, offering college credit for courses, and an increased general emphasis on language proficiency.

Table 134. Improvements in Language Training, CA Focus Groups

Frequency	Ways to improve training
2	allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
1	SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
3	Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
1	Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
1	Keep class size small (under 10)
2	other comments
5	CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
1	Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
4	Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
1	Immersion training is best
9	other comments

As can be seen above, these comments were quite varied. Some themes present in the other comments include more resources available from home (for reservists), using the OPI to assess proficiency, and allowing immersion training immediately after classroom training.

Special Reserve Issues/Comments

While most of these comments were coded as Block 2 comments, special issues regarding reserve troops were mentioned in all three blocks. The reserve CA units mentioned many valid points related to language training for reservists. Given that three of the seven total reserve groups were CA units, these issues look much like those described earlier.

There were five comments indicating that language training should take place with or right after other types of training. There were also three other comments related to timing issues.

These groups made several comments related to timing issues. Five comments stated that taking time to attend a program like DLI is not feasible. Two comments indicated the lack of time during drill weekends to practice language skills.

Ten comments centered on the lack of training immediately prior to deployment, one of the most critical periods.

Summaries for comments related to pay are given in the table below.

Table 135. Pay Issues for Reservists, CA Focus Groups

Frequency	pay issues
4	given lack of time during drills, consider paying people to study on their own time
2	FLPP is really low for reservists
3	FLPP is not a motivator for reservists
2	better FLPP would motivate reservists to study on their own
4	other pay comments
1	should be paid at lower proficiency levels than enlisted persons

As with all reserve groups, low FLPP is a crucial issue. CA reservists also indicated a lack of opportunity for immersion training (2 comments) and a lack of awareness that immersion training is available (2 comments). The CA group was also responsible nearly all the aggregate reservists comments related to the need for most widely available training opportunities (such as local colleges, DL, etc.).

Lastly, six of nine comments on leadership support for language training indicated that there was little or no support. No comments indicated high support level with only two comments indicating some support.

The full tabulated code sheet for the CA Block 3 comments is available in Appendix R. Reserve unit sheets appear in Appendix S.

Narrative Comments

ACCA96 Block 1:
One of the major themes that went throughout the transcript was respect and understanding of the culture of the region is very important in that it opens doors and builds rapport with the locals. Understanding the culture is tied to language. Additionally, showing effort to learn the language and customs of the region does a lot to combat the ugly American stereotype. This of course helps to developed relationships with the locals. Also, the use of interpreters in Africa is essential.

ACCA96 Block 2:
Immersion training is highly valued by this group. This group highlighted that SF and CA have different training needs. This group also indicated that speaking is more important than reading and writing and therefore the DLPT is not a good measurement.

ACCA96 Block 3:
This group thinks that SOF should be in charge of the language training, so it's more efficient and can be tailored on the fly. They also seem to favor OPI over DLPT, because the former takes into account listening and speaking skills.

RCCA25 Block 1:
As for this block, it is evident that some level of language proficiency is desired just to build a rapport with and gain the trust of the locals. A minimum level of proficiency is also recommended for simple navigation and getting around as well as to understanding the locals. Language should be taught with an emphasis on the culture of the region. Much discussion centers on a specific language instructor that was enthusiastic and passionate about teaching Arabic. Most agreed that they learn more from someone like this than someone that just goes through the book without showing any enthusiasm. A common theme in the discussion is that translators can be beneficial, but they are not to be trusted. It is best if you have someone in your unit that is fluent enough for translation purposes.

RCCA25 Block 2:
With this group, immersion and pay are potential motivators for language training. However, most feel that more time could be devoted to language training than is devoted to it now. They also feel that the training they currently

receive could be more flexible in terms of what they learn. They wanted to have days (or times) when they only spoke the language they were learning, and they wanted to speak it in real-world settings (i.e., in a restaurant). The idea of having advanced courses and beginner courses was suggested, as was the idea of people in the team learning different languages so everyone has something to offer regardless of where the team gets deployed.

RCCA25 Block 3:
Topics discussed in this group centered on possible motivators for building language skills. Specifically money, promotion points, and college credit would be motivating. Additionally, immersion opportunities would also be motivating;

RCCA64 Ft. Lewis Block 1:
There were a number of examples given about how language was useful to a mission. General language and national languages were useful. Proficiency ranged from 1-1 to 3-3. All agreed that language was vital to mission success. Examples included navigation along roads, reading warning signs, communicating with locals, communicating with coalition troops, and communicating in international meetings. Interpreters were used frequently, usually local. Some troops ran into trouble with the local interpreters having their own agendas. It is beneficial to have both language skills and an interpreter. Some used aids such as books with critical words. There was indication of a few taking part in pre-mission language prep. This helped prepare them as well. Additional language skills needed include more speaking and listening training, more technical/military language, and more cultural training (immersion would be helpful). The benefits of proficiency include better navigation skills, building credibility and rapport with locals, enhancing translation with interpreter, enhances communication effectiveness, and increases situational awareness. The consequences of a lack of proficiency include slowing down a mission, making it more dangerous, decreasing its effectiveness, and causing unnecessary damage.

RCCA64 Ft. Lewis Block 2:
It is apparent that language is critical to CA. Some said it was as critical as weapons training. Several key issues emerged in this discussion. First, FLPP system is flawed because reserves don't get equal pay as actives, it takes reserves too long to qualify for FLPP and to get recertified. Also, not enough time is dedicated to language training for most to attain a proficiency level to qualify for FLPP. Another issue is that reservists do not know where they will be deployed so they may not get to use the language they learn in-country. One solution offered was to list 10 languages and let people choose which one they want to learn and learn it. If needed later, send people to the country where they can speak that language.

RCCA64 Ft. Lewis Block 3:
Rewards, recognition, and a better structured pay system would help motivate people to learn a language. There was quite a bit overlap with some of block 2 content.

RCCA64 Portland Block 1:
In this block, several themes emerged. First, in addition to having language skills, having an understanding of the culture of the nation is critical. This includes an understanding of religion and cultural etiquette. Further, most participants agreed that interpreters were helpful; however, interpreters should be selected carefully and should be cautiously assessed for their intentions, especially if the culture of the interpreter conflicts with the culture of the natives. In addition, most participants agreed that speaking, reading, writing, and listening are important skills but the importance of each depends upon the level of the situation. Lastly, being able to build rapport with the natives is key. This is often accomplished by demonstrating some minimal level of the native language, demonstrating a willingness to try to speak the native language, putting natives at ease, and demonstrating a willingness to engage in the cultural norms of the country.

RCCA64 Portland Block 2:
In this reservist block, the discussion centered around both issues that are more general to military personnel and issues that are more specific to reservists. According to this group of reservists, it is probably unrealistic for individuals in their unit to receive extensive language training because many of them are mature in their military careers. Further, the participants suggested that a mixture of classroom and experiential learning is key; however, total immersion learning and total classroom learning are less effective. The participants also noted that, for reservists, there is both a lack of time and a lack of available resources for language training. Several barriers were

identified and several solutions for removing the barriers were proposed. On the issue of FLPP, most participants agreed that the current pay is not a strong motivator nor should it be. Instead, they proposed providing reservists with professional, high-quality, and mission-oriented training to motivate them to learn languages and further, to send them on missions that allow them to use these skills. Lastly, most participants agreed that technology was a beneficial medium for language training but should not be used exclusively. Technology-driven training could be an ideal solution for providing reservists with less access to resources the training they need.

RCCA64 Portland Block 3:
This group indicated that at least small comprehension is necessary for all troops to understand the language. For some language like Thai, need to have an internet based tool that you can actually listen to the language, because learning it from a book is impossible. They indicated that a 1-1 should be required for everyone. Refresher or maintenance is also needed for all languages, because they are easily forgotten. One option might be through "battle drills" where unit members just speak the language all day, or through classroom refreshers. Barriers that prevent maintenance of language included lack of time, no language labs, and lack of qualified instructors.

Conclusions

CA groups indicated a higher need for cultural information in order to be effective on the job than did some other SOF types. This type of information is rarely taught in the classroom, which makes immersion training more important with CA units.

Several issues came up with CA reservists. These issues were not particular to CA SOF types of reservists, but were more frequently mentioned by CA groups than some other SOF types. Specifically, low FLPP, few opportunities for immersion training, and few opportunities to use acquired skills in the field highlighted the list of issues. Some also highlighted little support from command for language skills in general.

Given the central role of language utilization for CA reservists, the barriers to reservists language acquisition are substantial.

Psychological Operations (PO)

Frequency Results

Given the detail with which categories have been described elsewhere in the document, these frequency analyses are not described here in great detail. Instead, particularly interesting and/or important findings from those frequency analyses are document in text below. For more mundane or less important frequency results, the reader is referred to the appendix. Detailed frequency results for PO analyses for Block 1 active duty personnel can be found in Appendix T with that of reservists in Appendix U. Detailed frequency results for PO analyses for Block 2 active duty personnel can be found in Appendix V with that of reservists in Appendix W. Detailed frequency results for PO analyses for Block 3 active duty personnel can be found in Appendix X with that of reservists in Appendix Y.

Like other units, speaking and listening were the most important. Of the comments on the topic, PO groups unanimously indicated the importance of around town language as compared to technical military language.

PO units tended to report using more local interpreters than ones provided by the military.

Comments indicated that PO personnel were particularly sensitive to political issues involved with selecting local interpreters. Nine comments across active and reserve groups indicated problems with choosing an interpreter from an ethnic group in cases when there may be local problems between ethnic groups. Eight additional comments indicated the general need to take care when choosing an interpreter.

PO groups had many comments (12 total) relating to the importance of an understanding of the culture of an environment in which they worked. These groups seemed particularly concerned about a broader understanding of the environment than would normally be obtained via classroom training.

Like some other groups, building rapport or trust was a commonly cited benefit of language proficiency.

Also like other groups, PO groups suggested incorporating speaking into an assessment of language proficiency.

Several of the comments indicated special issues for reserve groups were mentioned by PO reservists. One common theme was a lack of pre-deployment training (10 comments). An example comment is: "But as far as the pre-deployment training, there was nothing set up saying, okay, you're deploying to Iraq on such and such a date; before that you need to go through refresher training,"

Several reserve groups in this unit also indicated the important role that electronic devices can play (11 comments). An example includes: "...but you meet a translator, an interpreter who's actually pretty good and if you can establish your own rapport with, you can pull him to the side for a few minutes or whatever and say, put this in the Iraqi dialect, say this in Iraqi dialect. Say these key phrases that you need to have to put out on loudspeaker broadcasts or things like that." However, some reservists reported having to buy their own electronic devises or not receiving any compensation when their personal electronic devices were destroyed while deployed in Iraq.

A lack of awareness of language resources was indicated as an issue in five reserve groups.

Narrative Summary

ACPO4 Block 1:
The group talked mostly about the importance of being able to engage in conversations with locals. Being able to speak the language on their own without the aid of a translator seemed to be overall consensus amongst the group. It was apparent that having a translator in certain situations is very essential, although the use value is debatable and can be costly to the mission especially if the translator does not speak the source language and/or reacts aggressively. Knowing how to speak, read and write the language helps in building rapport, trust, and communication. Also being aware of the culture, what to say and not say is very important.

ACPO4 Block 2:
This group began speaking about the training programs and believe, in general, that the DLI and SWC are too short. It would be useful to have more time at theses programs and to have them after all other training. This is because there will be less down time when you would lose the language before your mission. It was also suggested that the course incorporate training materials such as movies, news reports, and newspapers from the target country. Also, having a variety of instructors teach small courses would be more effective because it would introduce different dialects. The DLPT does not incorporate enough military terms or speaking. As a result, the courses lack an emphasis on these two things as well. Immersion training is definitely beneficial. Immersion can teach you about culture, whereas the formal course instruction does not. They were excited about the option of have a an isolated site where people could get together for a US-based immersion training course. Pay is definitely a motivator to learn the language for some of the individuals. It would be beneficial to have specialized PSYOP language training that went along with their core job tasks. The OPI was considered a good test, but should also incorporate listening skills.

ACPO4 Block 3:
General themes included extending the pay system to include 1-1 and 5-5 to encourage further proficiency. Other suggestions included building in language days/activities into soldiers day-to-day duties. Also, immersion as an incentive for language acquisition was mentioned.

RCP011 Block 1:
This group had a number of examples of missions where they used language in missions. Languages ranged from local dialect to more general languages. Most of the tasks required some language proficiency, mainly general language. Speaking and listening were most important for effective communication, to build credibility, and to build rapport. There were problems with the interpreters, many times these people would desert or communicate ineffectively due to their own agendas. Understanding the culture and local dialect was important in order to communicate effectively and avoid danger. Translators need to be able to speak English well. Electronics as well as note cards are used. The electronics are not utilized as frequently due to lack of awareness or training. Cultural

awareness is definitely a necessity More time in formal language training is needed. If there is not adequate language proficiency it can be dangerous, cause unnecessary damage, and slow the mission.

RCP011 Block 2:
The main ideas of this group are that there is inadequate language training for them and there does not seem to be support from command to remedy this problem. Few of them were able to do immersion, but it would be very helpful. One person suggested doing a short-term immersion with the help of the host country military. They would like to see more local opportunities to take language courses, like at community colleges. They also believe that language should be required for their positions and that this requirement would likely result in more support. Of course all training is hindered by time constraints. FLPP is low and this is not helpful in creating an incentive for language training. But, more than money they want to know a language in order to be successful on their mission. Digital recorders are very helpful, but there are few resources to go around so they end up purchasing their own equipment and risk damaging it. The CDs and Cassettes don't work as well due to the damage from the environment. The DLPT is a reasonably good test in their opinion, but many had to take it with little preparation and in a noisy environment. To improve the test they would like to see more common language and slang. Definitely more military operation terms are needed too.

RCP011 Block 3:
Speaking, listening, and reading are the main priorities. Training should come in the beginning of the pipeline in a classroom setting with required maintenance after that. Maintenance can be immersion for three weeks annually or additional language training at a school. Local college classes would be another maintenance option for reserves as long as they are reimbursed for what they spend. It would also be helpful if the army brings language training programs to them locally. DL and language labs would also be useful. There should be requirements for ongoing maintenance. By making the training mandatory then it would become a priority for the leaders and as far as financial support is concerned. There should also be someone in charge of supervising the maintenance and training of language skills. There should be a broad-base of languages to choose from, soldiers should not be pigeon-holed into taking a certain language. Also, proficiency pay should increase and be expanded in order to give incentives to 1-1 proficiencies. This will encourage then to learn more language. Immersion opportunities can also serve as incentives. More improvements include creating an SOF language program and opening up more slots in DLI for reserves. It is important that local language opportunities are also available for reserves due to the constraints of their civilian jobs.

301[St] Block 1:
The main points addressed in this block pertained to interpreters and lack of language training. Basically, this group was not trained in language (either in pre-employment, or while they were there), which is a problem. They said that while it may not be necessary to have complete language mastery, knowing basic phrases would be beneficial. That way, they would be able to pull security checks on their translators. Translators are a huge problem—they can never be fully trusted. Religious beliefs, and translators from different areas would change meaning to suit their own needs. Additionally, the few language CD's that they had, had many incorrect sayings in them, leading to miscommunications. There was just a basic lack of language training in this group.

301[St] Block 2:
The group again noted the lack of language training opportunities and resources for reserve troops. Some of the common themes that were suggested as solutions were paying people to maintain their language the same as for active duty. Also, better advertisement of training opportunities and compensating the reservists for training and maintenance on their own.

301st Block 3:
One of the more common suggestions is to do pre-deployment language training. Also, reservists compensation issues were talked about. Some of the themes that immerged were give promotion points for language training and actually pay reservists for receiving training. Distance education was seen as a possibility for training, but only if a language instructor wasn't available.

Conclusions

This group seemed to place a premium on cultural understanding of the area within which they are working. Several issues involving reservists came up with these groups, including a lack of awareness of available resources. Another theme of reservists was that pre-deployment language training should really be conducted, because at present, there is hardly any occurring at all. As with other reserve groups, the PO reserve groups indicated issues with pay, resources (training and maintenance accessibility), and support from leadership were key issues.

Navy SEALs

Frequency Results

Given the detail with which categories have been described elsewhere in the document, these frequency analyses are not described here in great detail. Instead, particularly interesting and/or important findings from those frequency analyses are document in text below. For more mundane or less important frequency results, the reader is referred to the appendix.

SEAL units reported a mix of training and downfield missions. They also reported that more general languages were generally adequate (as compared to local dialects).

Though there were few comments on the topic, three of four indicated that minimum proficiency is adequate.

Like other units, SEALs overwhelmingly indicated that speaking and listening were the most important language skills to acquire. SEALs units indicated benefits of proficiency that were similar to other units (and described in the overall summary analyses).

SEALs also suggested other options for training. While these topics varied considerable some centered on the idea of having SOF create its own language short course, which would be mandatory. These comments were sometimes given in concert with comments indicating limitations of DLI programs (of which there were twelve such comments).

SEALs made several comments indicating that some training should be mandatory for all, but that advanced training should be optional, based on interests and abilities (9 comments).

As with some other SOF types, time was a constraint to language acquisition for SEALs. However, some comments indicated a general under-emphasis throughout the culture with the unit. As an example comment indicates when talking about common conceptions of SEALs "...'Leave that <languages> to the linguists who are operators—we kick in doors', type of thing."

These groups also indicated that a change in pay may lead to higher motivation to acquire language proficiency. However, most comments related to increasing pay using the current FLPP system rather than changing the system fundamentally.

Detailed frequency results for Navy SEALs analyses for Block 1 personnel can be found in Appendix Z. Detailed frequency results for Navy SEALs analyses for Block 2 personnel can be found in Appendix AA, while detailed frequency results for Navy SEALs analyses for Block 3 personnel can be found in Appendix AB.

Narrative Summary

ACN SAN Block 1:
This group does not like using non-military interpreters in the Middle East. Also, the validity of the certification was called into question. These individuals all seem to believe that at least a basic understanding of the language is something that should be trained. Also, they think that there is not enough emphasis on speaking in the training programs and too much put on listening.

ACN SAN Block 2:

This group spent almost the entire time discussing the benefits of immersion training. The group also spent time trying to think of new and better ways to implement and manage immersion training.

ACN SAN Block 3:

For this group speaking was the priority. The proficiency required ranged from basic to 3-3, but all agree that a basic understanding is necessary and then those that have a talent and desire for advanced levels should be made a priority. Training should come before they are sent to the unit, but there should also be ongoing training requirements during their tour. Anywhere from 3 months or less should be sufficient beginner training. The language should be focused on military and common language. Maintenance and refreshers should be ongoing throughout the tour with a short refresher right before the mission. Immersion is the best training, but the individuals need to be identified as mature and competent to benefit from it. Also, college language course are a good option. There should be requirements or incentives to maintain training. A classroom/immersion combo is good for initial acquisition. Basic training should be mandatory and advanced is optional. Time is a major barrier as well as a lack of understanding from operations about the importance of language to the success of a mission. Making language a priority would be helpful. Pay is an incentive, but other traveling opportunities or entrance into specific programs can be an incentive too.

ACN 2 Block 1:

A general theme running through this transcript was the importance of being able to effectively communicate with the locals. Specific skills that were mentioned were being able to read, speak, and listen effectively. Additionally, an understanding of the culture and being able to watch the news and read the newspaper contributed to mission success.

ACN 2 Block 2:

Several general themes emerged, although there is some disagreement regarding these issues throughout the focus group. First, individuals believe that more emphasis should be placed on where training falls in the pipeline. Whereas some participants feel that it should be at the beginning of the pipeline, others believe that initial training takes people away from their jobs during a critical time. Second, there was a lot of agreement regarding the requirement of training: as a more formal integration of training in the typical pipeline, as a motivator for training participation, and as a way to ensure that training is completed by everyone. Third, most participants agreed that DLI is an effective training method, although it may be important for SOF to construct their own training program that is short, tailored, and conducted on-site. Lastly, most individuals agreed that pay could be a motivator but that current pay is not. Further, individuals who are more initially inclined to learn a language should be identified because they will be more motivated than others.

ACN2 Block 3:

Some common themes emerged in this focus group. One common theme was the need for more pay associated with language training. Additionally, suggestions were made to provide better advertisement for the language programs. Also, there was a common theme regarding motivation for language training. A few motivational suggestions were that language training needs to be encouraged more and more time needs to be set aside for training. Overall the theme from this block was that everyone should get some language training.

Conclusions

SEAL groups clearly appreciated the positive benefits of language training, even though it is a lower priority than their core tasks and possibly a lower priority than for some other groups. One suggestion concerned the need for an SOF controlled language program. DLI programs were not seen as being appropriate for SEAL units.

Navy SWCC

Frequency Results

Only one focus group comprised the SWCC sample. All eight comments for this group indicated that training was the primary mission within which they were involved. All were proficient in Spanish and indicated that local dialects were typically not required for successful job performance. As a result of their training missions, they indicated that technical military knowledge was more important than was more general-use language knowledge.

Like others, this group also considered speaking and listening to be the most important skills. This group, however, seemed to place less importance on understanding the cultural climate of the location than did some other groups working in downrange settings.

This group also was aware of the dangers of a lack of proficiency, including possible injury. As an example: "Moderator: So safety is a big concern? Response: Huge. That is a very big—with boat tactics it can get pretty complicated out there and very dangerous." The comment continued to state that language played a huge role in maintaining safety.

With respect to constraints on language acquisition, priority given to core job tasks was indicated in three comments. In response to prompting of why persons learned languages all five comments indicated that it was in order to make job tasks easier.

Criticisms of the DLPT for this group centered on instances that they had observed where someone was a native Spanish speaker, yet cannot score well on the DLPT. As an example comment: "people look at me, and here's this great, big, dumb redneck coming in here taking this test and scoring a 3,3 on it, and then you get people that are actually host nation speakers, I mean that's their original language, they're scoring lower on the test.".

With respect to making training recommendations both comments on the topic indicated that a 2-2 proficiency would be adequate. Recommendations for early v. late in the training pipeline were mixed.

This group indicated that the language lab may be useful for maintenance training (3 comments). This could be due to their background in Spanish. Presumably most language labs would be better stocked with Spanish materials than those of some other languages.

Comments indicated that some training should be mandatory for everyone. Two comments recommended voluntary additional training as well.

Time, again was seen as the biggest constraint to language acquisition and maintenance (9 comments). A lack of a structured maintenance program was also seen as problematic (3 comments). One recommendation was to include maintenance in annual planning.

Two comments suggested removing the cap on the number of language for which someone could be compensated. A general increase in pay under the current system was also suggested.

Two comments indicated that SOF needed its own language school to better address the language needs of SOF personnel.

Detailed frequency results for Navy SWCC analyses for Blocks 1-3 personnel can be found in Appendix AC-AE.

Narrative Summary

ACN22 Block 1:

The members of this group seemed to imply that being able to speak the language was very important for their survival and their effectiveness as teachers. They made several comments stating that the DLPT was not very valid because native speakers tended to score lower, or not pass at all, while high scorers were ineffective in the field. They also implied that an understanding of the culture was important and that it was also important to know the rules of the games they play in the host country. The members of this group implied that there were not enough people in the units who could speak the language.

ACN22 Block 2:
The main points of the focus group are the lack of adequate formal training, the lack of time for training, poor incentives for language skills, and a lack of understanding from operations on what language proficiency means and how important it is for the job. Most of the individuals in this group received informal language training on their own. One or two actually had classroom and immersion training. A major complaint was that once you were a 2-2 or 3-3 the leadership decided you did not need to have any additional classroom training or ongoing support. More time and opportunity was identified as a definite need. The language skills are very important to the missions that these individuals are a part of and they are frustrated when they have inadequate skills. It also seems that FID is not an official part of the job that they are to be doing, yet they are constantly doing FID. It is just a necessary part of their missions, yet it is not recognized by their superiors. Thus, they are not adequately trained to be doing it. Another overall complaint was the poor incentive system for knowing and maintaining more than one language. It seems as though they would put more effort into it if they were paid more for it. Right now their time is tight, so proficiency is not a priority. Lastly, the tutors and available language labs do not offer enough types of languages. They would like to see tutors that are enthusiastic and trained in both the foreign language and Special Forces language.

ACN22 Block 3:
The groups that presented agreed on all major points including the priority for speaking and listening ability. A 2-2 level of proficiency is needed. Training should go along with required basic training, but toward the end before going to a unit. There was no specification of time or primary emphasis. Refreshers should be either in the form of immersion training or should occur when individuals are given time to leave the operation and study the language with no distraction. Maintenance would be best served through language labs with good CDs and AV material. Also, it was suggested that being able to take the material home would be helpful. As far as language lab training, a weekly visit to the lab was indicated as sufficient. For sustaining and enhancing language, immersion should be offered. Training should be mandatory for the basic level and voluntary for the advance level. Barriers include lack of money and time due to op tempo. More money and making language training a priority would help. Pay should be increased for language proficiency and there should be pay bonuses for language at re-enlistment. They also mentioned earning points for promotion because of language proficiency. Lastly, it would help to have a separate SOF language school to meet their specific language needs.

Conclusions

This group also perceived a need for language proficiency. Given the maneuvers commonly performed by SWCC units, communication is imperative. This group also perceived limitations to DLI programs for SOF personnel and advocated an SOF controlled language training program of some type.

Navy Special Operations

Frequency Results

One focus group comprised this sample. All focus group members have proficiency in Spanish. Detailed frequency results for Navy Special Operations analyses for Blocks 1- 3 can be found in Appendices AF-AH.

All eight comments on the topic indicate that this group is engaged in training others. While comments did differ, most indicated that general language, such as Spanish, was sufficient for effective communication. Like other groups speaking and listening topped the list of skills needed to be effective on the job. However, written communication was also emphasized in a small number of comments.

This group reported frequently using interpreters, both military and locals. While there was some lack of trust for local interpreters, there were not a large amount of comments regarding interpreters.

Among benefits of proficiency, building rapport or trust was the only type of comment coded (4 comments).

There were nine comments dealing with immersion training, though seven did not fit into the existing coding schemes well. Among these "other" comments, suggestions like setting people up with jobs during immersion training, making sure that when multiple people are immersed together that they are all about the same level of proficiency, and having tasks around town to accomplish while on immersion training.

As with other units, this group have several negative comments relating to the DLPT. Four comments were negative in a general way, one complained of much variation in speaking ability within a proficiency level, and five comments were classified as "other". Some of the themes among "other" comments include: the DLPT only tests broad languages such as Spanish, not regional dialects and several comments indicating that the scoring for that test is too subjective. Other comments concerned not testing speaking ability.

Regarding the position of language training in the training pipeline, three of four comments indicated that language training should occur late in the pipeline. Eight of the nine comments indicated that immersion training was important or ideal for language maintenance.

With regards to barriers to language acquisition, two comments indicated that time constraints played a role. Another two indicated a lack of emphasis on language training (not ensuring proper job assignment to utilize skills).

There were many comments related to changing the compensation system in order to encourage language acquisition and maintenance. Two comments suggested paying FLPP based on the length of time someone has maintained proficiency. Two more suggested paying more for more difficult languages (e.g., Arabic). Other themes were not putting a cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated, and pay based on usage.

Two comments suggested that SOF run its own language programs or school.

Narrative Summary

ACN SK Block 1:
This group does not like the DLPT and want to see it revised. Also, they are a training unit, so all their missions were in the context of training. A common theme through all of the comments is that in Spanish, there are many different dialects, which creates complications. It was suggested that languages with multiple dialects should reflected in assessment. Additionally resources are needed to help the instructors better know and understand all the different dialects.

ACNSK Block 2:
These group members really like immersion, not only as a way to maintain a language, but also as a way to learn it. It was also suggested that immersion could be used as a possible reward for maintaining proficiency. However, there were a lot of negative comments about the Berlitz immersion program. Additionally, some issues arose with the assessment of proficiency and with pay for proficiency.

ACNSK Block 3:
As far as training is considered, it would be nice to have an SOF language school to cater to special language needs of the SOF. Initial training should be in the classroom with immersion training acting as maintenance. The mandatory proficiency level should be a 3-3 and speaking and listening are a priority. The pay should increase to a minimum of $300 for a 3-3, maybe even $400 for the more difficult languages. Right now there is not equal pay between different branches of the military and the group members belief this should be changed. Other incentives besides pay would be the opportunity to go to great locations for immersion or awarding college credit for language training. Also, there is a need for the language proficient tests to better assess native speakers. Right now native speakers do not score as high on the tests so the perception is that the test is unfair. People with prior language skills, such as Korean-Americans should be recruited due to impending crises. Once individuals are proficient in the language they should be tracked throughout the military system so if there is an emergency proficient speakers will

be able to be identified. Barriers to language proficiency are the lack of support from command and the lack of time due to op tempo. Command should build in time set aside for language training and maintenance. Language labs can be useful for maintenance. However, immersion was the overall winner. Suggestions were made for have immersion annually and biannually for 3-4 weeks. During immersion training, the individual should hold a regular job, like with the Ministry of Tourism, and have free time to enjoy the country. There was no clear statement about training being mandatory. It seemed as though group members suggested that if the choice is made to go to a certain training program then language training would be mandatory. Finally, there was emphasis placed on the importance of military language training.

Conclusions

One of the major themes discussed was perceived problems with language proficiency tests. Immersion was seen to be the best overall language training practice. Members felt that they learned the language much better if they were immersed in the culture. However, language training should first be conducted in the classroom, before immersion occurs. To better assist in the language training, a language school with resources should be provided, as well as pay for proficiency levels. Overall, the Berlitz training program was not very helpful, and people did not have favorable things to say about it. DLI training programs were not seen as optimal by this group, instead some comments recommended SOF develop and run some of its own language programs to better suit its needs.

Overall Recommendations

Several recommendations can be made to increase the effectiveness of language training within the SOF. Among these:

- Focus SOF related training and testing on speaking and conversational listening skills to the extent possible. However, to learn a language effectively, the other skill modalities are needed as well.
- Pay FLPP for speaking proficiency as measured by an Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) or other speaking assessment. Paying personnel for the skills they actually use on the job makes sense from a mission effectiveness standpoint, compensation standpoint, and an individual motivational standpoint.
- Lower the required level of proficiency needed to receive some FLPP, particularly for difficult languages. Currently, a 2-2 proficiency in Arabic is not tenable for many SOF units and surpasses their needed proficiency levels given their job duties. Receiving FLPP at lower levels would at least encourage some basic proficiency in a language and provide a realistic incentive to improve language proficiency to higher levels. As many comments indicate, even basic proficiency can have many desirable outcomes. Also, having even minimal proficiency could greatly help in selecting a local interpreter for many units. Based on the comments of study participants, paying FLPP for 1+, 1+ or 1+ would provide a more realistic, motivating first step in the ladder to achieve higher proficiency.
- Create a new SOF specific test of language proficiency that assesses conversational skills of both military specific language and colloquial language. Though such a test would be difficult to standardize, it would seem to be a more valid measure of language skills as they are used by SOF units. This could be accomplished with a modified DLI OPI.
- Create SOF-type specific training programs where feasible and where they do not exist. Even if these were run through DLI, the types of language skills needed by SOF units differ considerably from those currently taught at DLI. SOF-type specific programs would allow more rapid curriculum changes to reflect likely locations in which trainees would eventually work. Regional or local dialects could be covered as well as some basic information regarding the culture of the location.
- Given the diversity of training being conducted in the SOF community, no conclusions could be drawn about training effectiveness from the focus group data. A comprehensive, standardized study and multiple customized studies of training effectiveness in the SOF community would help leaders to determine which training options provide the greatest benefit for SOF units and personnel. The same should be required of DLI training.
- Provide job aids and special enhancement training courses or tools that address military and technical language related to the missions.

- Consider alternative training strategies such as designating days/time in which only foreign languages will be spoken. Such activities consume very few resources yet could greatly reinforce language maintenance.
- Based on some comments that raised questions about the DLPT testing process, DLI should review their testing protocols. Additionally, DLI should be encouraged to provide a full accounting of the reliability and validity of the DLPT and OPI as required by the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, 1999) of all test providers.
- Raise compensation (i.e., FLPP) for reserve units. Reservists should receive full FLPP. Given the difficulty in accessing resources to maintain language proficiency and the extremely low compensation that reserve units receive for maintaining proficiency, most reserve units have low motivation to acquire and maintain language proficiency.
- Utilize Mobile Training Detachments (MTD) to provide training "on the fly" to units that do not have an established language training program, especially reserve units.
- Educate unit commanders and staff officers, command language program managers, and SOF personnel about the language learning tools and training options available for their use and about funding options for other programs.
- Provide more training options for reserve units such as paying for tuition for local college language courses and investing in DL and TDT programs for reservists.
- Include all language training during initial training cycle (e.g., MOS training or AIT for their SOF type) for reserve units where appropriate. Time constraints make training for these units difficult one the initial period is over.
- Provide pre-deployment language and culture training for activated reserve units and active duty units working outside their primary AO. This training should be customized to the mission.

References

American Educational Research Association (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing.*

  Washington, DC: Author.

Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Emergence vs. forcing: Basics of grounded theory analysis.* Mill Valley, CA: Sociology
  Press.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New
  York: Aldine.

McClelland, S. B. (1994). Training needs assessment data-gathering methods: Part 3, focus groups. *Journal of
  European Industrial Training, 18*(3), 29-32.

Swanson, R. A. (1994). *Analysis for improving performance: Tools for diagnosing organizations and documenting
  workplace expertise*. San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.

Tannenbaum, S. (2002). A strategic view of organizational training and learning. In K. Kraiger (Ed.), *Creating,
  implementing, and managing effective training and development: State of the art lessons for practice* (pp.10-
  52). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Willig, C. (1999). *Applied discourse analysis: Social and psychological interventions*. Buckingham: Open
  University Press.

Zemke, R., & Kramlinger, T. (1982). *Figuring things out: A trainer's guide to needs and task analysis*. Reading,
  MA: Addison-Wesley.

Zemke, R. (1994). *Training needs assessment: The broadening focus of a simple concept*. New York: The Guilford
  Press.

Appendix A:

SOFLO Language Transformation Strategy Development Project
Focus Group Interview Guide

SOFLO Language Transformation Strategy Development Project
Focus Group Interview Guide

The script that follows is prepared as a <u>guide</u> to assist you in moderating the focus group(s) you are assigned.
Sample Timeline & Script
8:15/13:15

[Participants Arrive, sign-in, receive focus group guidelines, and name plates (first name only); name plates will have a number 1 to 12 for the note takers. Give them a copy of the first question block.]

8:30/13:30

SOFLO Liaison: Please take a seat so we can begin. Good morning/afternoon! My name is **[SOFLO Liaison name],** and I am here on behalf of the SOF Language Office. We want to know your views about language proficiency, training, and related issues. The information that you provide will help us to understand the issues from the SOF Operators' perspective. Your input will help us develop a comprehensive language strategy for SOF. Thank you for taking time to talk with us today and caring about SOF language. Now, I want to introduce the person who will be conducting this focus group **[Dr. Surface/Thompson].**

8:35/13:35

Moderator: Good morning/afternoon! I want to echo what **[SOFLO Liaison Name]** said. Your input is important to our project, and we appreciate your time. We will be using the information you provide to develop a comprehensive strategy to guide policy and resource allocations related to initial acquisition and sustainment/enhancement training. You opinions and experience play an important developing the SOF language strategy.

First, when you arrived, you received a list of ground rules designed to ensure the session runs smoothly. **[Go over a few of the rules.]** If you have a comment, please get my attention by raising your hand or by some other means that doesn't disrupt the conversation.

> Unclassified version
> No last names or ranks
> Speak one at a time; Get my attention
> Speak clearly, loudly and toward the microphone
> Military Jargon and Acronyms

Second, there are not "right or wrong" answers to our questions. We are interested in your honest thoughts and opinions. You'll notice that we are taking notes of our discussion, and we will be recording this focus group so that the transcripts can be analyzed. To protect your confidentiality, the introductions are not recorded and no names or group ids are assigned to the transcripts. Once the "tape" is transcribed, it will be erased (to prevent voice recognition).

As a psychologist, it's important to me to protect your confidentiality. I want to assure you that the transcript we make of our discussion will not be used for any purpose other than the writing of a research report by the data analysts. **No one involved in the focus group will be identified by name. The recorder will not be activated until after the introductions. When referring to yourself or others, please use only their first names.** Please speak one at a time and regard the note taking as simply an extension of my (the moderator's) memory.

Third, the format of today's session is on your handout. **[Review agenda].** The times are a rough estimation. The segments will vary in time.

[The moderator starts the introduction by talking about himself/herself.]

I'd like to begin by going around the circle, starting at my right, and letting each of you introduce yourself *briefly* by telling us the following things **[write on first page of the board]:**

- **First Name**

- **MOS/NEC (naval enlisted specialty code)/AFSC (Air Force Specialty Code)**
- **UNIT**
- **Years in Service/SOF**
- **Language(s) and where trained in language**

[Each subject speaks]

Thank you.

Now, I think we all know a little bit about each other, I'd like to get started with the questions.

[Moderator will ask questions and summarize after each question as discussed.]

8:50/13:50

[Moderator should remind the participants to communicate critical incidents in such a way that they are unclassified.]

First Question Block (Language Usage & Capability Requirements):

Q1: *"Tell us about a situation were having language skills and capabilities contributed to mission success?"*
- *What was the proficiency level? How many on the team had language capability?*
- *Which of the core SOF tasks where involved?*
- *Did you do pre-mission language prep?*
- *Did you use job aids (e.g., Kwikpoint) to help prepare? If yes, what's your evaluation of the job aid?*

Q2: *"Tell us about a situation were not having sufficient language skill or capabilities was a challenge for the mission or degraded the mission outcome?"*
- *Which of the Core SOF tasks where involved?*
- *How did it take away from mission accomplishment?*
- *How did you overcome not having sufficient language capabilities?*

Q3: *"Which SOF missions require language capabilities? Please be specific in terms of language skill type (reading, listening, speaking, writing), activity (e.g., training troops on weapon maintenance, negotiation, etc.), and criticality of the activity. Be as descriptive as possible when talking about the specific activities."*

[Moderator summarizes first block and calls a short break.]

9:50/14:50

Break 1 (10 minutes maximum, 5 if running behind)

10:00/15:00

Second Question Block (Training):

Q4: *"Where do you think language training should be provided/offered in the development of a SOF operator [SF, SEALS, AFSOC, CA, PsyOp]? Please think about this question across the entire career lifecycle and in terms of initial acquisition, sustainment, and enhancement training."*
- *Should institutional, involuntary training be provided for [their SOF component]?*

Q5: *"We are interested in your experiences with language training. Tell us about the most effective language training in which you have participated. Be sure to consider all forms of training from initial acquisition to sustainment and enhancement. Be descriptive in terms of why it was effective."*

Q6: *"Tell us about the least effective language training in which you have participated. Be sure to consider all forms of training from initial acquisition to sustainment and enhancement. Be descriptive in terms of why it was not effective."*

[Moderator may only get to one or two of the following so they should be mixed up across groups. But, get to as many as possible.]

Q7: *"What are some of the barriers or things that keep you from maintaining or enhancing your language skills?"*

Q8: *"What things would motivate you or make it easier for you to take advantage of language training?"*

Q9: *"Can language training be integrated into other SOF training? Have you participated in any of these programs? What did you think?"*

Q10: *"Classroom training and live immersion training (LET) programs are not always available. Is distributive learning (DL) or technology-delivered training (TDT) a viable option for training language?" Give example if necessary.*

[Moderator summarizes second block and calls a short break.]

11:05/16:05
> **Break 2 (10 minutes maximum, 5 if running behind)**

11:15/16:15
> **[This block has the potential to go over in terms of time.]**
> **Third Question Block (Activity: Developing a language training strategy):**
>> You are to divide into 3 teams of 2 to 5 people (as assigned by the moderator). You will have 25 minutes to develop a decision briefing to be given to your unit commander. You should select a representative to brief, and your group should write up the basic points of your briefing on the paper provided. You will have 5 minutes to brief it. You will be given a 5-minute warning after 20 minutes have passed.

> **Please select one of the following:**

>> 1. The Commander of your SOF Unit asks you to develop a strategy and plan to transform current language capabilities to ensure mission success. He wants this yesterday. He asks you to prepare a 5-minute decision brief immediately, and he indicates your language improvement strategy and plan should consider/address the following:

- Mission language requirement
  - which language skills are relevant
  - what proficiency levels are needed
- Where training fits into the career lifecycle
- The most effective training options for initial acquisition and sustainment/enhancement training
  - whether initial acquisition training needs to be institutionalized for all operators
  - should training at all levels be voluntary or involuntary
  - The use and role of DL and other technology solutions
- Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities
  - What are these barriers?
  - How can they be removed?

- What programs would you recommend to motivate improved language proficiency?

2. The Commander of your SOF unit asks you to identify the top 3 actions that can be taken to improve language capability and readiness in your unit. He wants this yesterday. He asks you to prepare a 5-minute decision brief immediately. For each action, you must provide (1) the language capability and readiness issue the action impacts; (2) a rationale for how it impacts the language issue; (3) a rationale for why it is the best option for resolving the issue; (4) the specific details of the action's implementation; (5) an idea of where the action fits into the current command language program/strategy; and (6) any other information you believe the Commander needs to make a decision.

Divide into 3 teams of 2 to 5 people [depends on who shows]. You will have 25 minutes to develop your strategy and plan. You should write up the basic points to present to the group. You will have 5 minutes.

[The recorder is turned off, and the groups work. They are given chart paper and marker.]

[After 20 minutes, a 5-minute warning is given.]

[Recorder is turned back on and each group presents. The moderator asks the groups questions about their plans as appropriate.]

12:05/17:05
[Moderator will summarize entire focus group session. Be specific about any themes that emerged from the discussion.]

Before we conclude does any one have any additional comments or topics related to language that they would like to discuss.

[To SOFLO Liaison] Do you have any thing you would like to add?

Thank you all for your generosity in taking the time out of your busy schedules to talk with us today.

[Moderator ends interview.]

Appendix B:

Detailed Coding Scheme for Block 1 Comments

Categories

1	A			***Q1: "Tell us about a situation were having language skills and capabilities contributed to mission success?"***
1	A	1		*Tasks performed?*
1	A	1	a	Training others
1	A	1	b	Missions
1	A	1	c	other
1	A	2		*Which language was required of the mission:*
1	A	2	a	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
1	A	2	b	National language
1	A	2	c	Specific local dialect
1	A	2	d	other
1	A	3		*Level of proficiency required on the mission*
1	A	3	a	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases - listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
1	A	3	b	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
1	A	3	c	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful
1	A	3	e	other
1	A	5		*How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?*
1	A	5	a	Not at all
1	A	5	b	A little
1	A	5	c	A moderate amount
1	A	5	d	A lot
1	A	6		*Proficiencies needed?*
1	A	6	a	General language (around town)
1	A	6	b	Technical-job related or military terms
1	A	6	c	other
1	A	7		*Which is more important?*
1	A	7	a	Speaking

1	A	7				Reading
1	A	7	b			Reading
1	A	7	c			Writing
1	A	7	d			Listening
1	A	7	e			other
1	A	8				*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
1	A	8	b			Helpful but not essential
1	A	8	c			Essential
1	A	8	d			other
1	A	9				*Do the natives typically speak English*
1	A	9	a			Most of them
1	A	9	b			Some of them
1	A	9	c			Few of them
1	A	9	d			None of them
1	A	11				**Did you use job aids (e.g., Kwikpoint) to help prepare? If yes, what's your evaluation of the job aid?**
1	A	11	a			**translators/interpreters**
1	A	11	a	1		*How often*
1	A	11	a	1	a	yes - local interpreters, frequently
1	A	11	a	1	b	yes - local interpreters, infrequently
1	A	11	a	1	c	yes - military provided interpreters, frequently
1	A	11	a	1	d	yes - military provided interpreters, infrequently
1	A	11	a	1	e	rarely used interpreters
1	A	11	a	2		*How important is it to use interpreters*
1	A	11	a	2	a	Essential
1	A	11	a	2	b	Helpful
1	A	11	a	2	c	Of little use
1	A	11	a	3		*Issues in selecting interpreter*
1	A	11	a	3	a	Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
1	A	11	a	3	b	Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)

1	A	11	a	3	c	As long as they speak English their OK
1	A	11	a	3	d	Proper selection interpreters is important
1	A	11	a	3	f	Can't trust interpreters
1	A	11	a	3	g	other interpreter issues
1	A	11	d			**Note cards with phrases**
1	A	11	d	1		sometime
1	A	11	d	2		always
1	A	11	d	3		other
1	A	11	e			**jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal**
1	A	11	e	1		on occasion
1	A	11	F			**other**
1	C					*General Themes:*
1	C	1				*Additional Language Training Needs*
1	C	1	a			Spoken
1	C	1	b			Written
1	C	1	d			Street/slang
1	C	1	e			Formal/presentation language
1	C	1	f			Flexibility - broad range of skills
1	C	1	g			Cultural language training
1	C	1	h			Cultural non-verbal language training
1	C	1	i			Dialect Training
1	C	1	j			Immersion training
1	C	1	k			More time in formal classes
1	C	1	n			Other
1	C	2				*Benefits of proficiency:*
1	C	2	a			*Basic*
1	C	2	a	1		Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
1	C	2	a	2		Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
1	C	2	a	3		Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility

1	C	2	b		*More advanced*
1	C	2	b	2	Identifying important documents in another language
1	C	2	b	3	Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
1	C	2	b	4	Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
1	C	2	b	5	other
1	C	2	c		*Unspecified*
1	C	2	c	1	Builds rapport/trust
1	C	2	c	2	Enhances communication effectiveness
1	C	2	c	3	Increases efficiency/speed of mission
1	C	2	c	5	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
1	C	2	c	6	Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
1	C	2	c	7	Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
1	C	2	c	8	Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
1	C	2	D		other
1	C	3			*Consequences of a lack of proficiency:*
1	C	3	a		Can be dangerous
1	C	3	b		May causes mission abort/failure
1	C	3	c		May slow mission
1	C	3	d		May decrease mission effectiveness
1	C	3	e		May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)
1	C	3	f		Can lead to selection of inappropriate translator
1	D				*Other comments:*

4   *incomplete data - not able to code (across all blocks)*

Appendix C:

Detailed Coding Scheme for Block 2 Comments

2	A			**General issues in training effectiveness**
2	A	1		*with immersion*
2	A	1	a	timing (too long before deployment)
2	A	1	b	immersed with others or by self
2	A	1	d	cultural aspect of immersion is important
2	A	1	f	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
2	A	1	g	other
2	A	2		*that contribute to a lack of preparation*
2	A	2	a	missions in many locations
2	A	2	b	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
2	A	2	c	other
2	A	3		*tools to use in training/preparation*
2	A	3	a	reading - to build vocabulary
2	A	3	b	language labs are very valuable
2	A	3	c	other
2	A	5		*Why do people learn languages*
2	A	5	a	Current pay is not a strong motivator
2	A	5	b	Pride / wanting to do a better job
2	A	5	c	To make missions easier on themselves
2	A	5	d	Pay
2	A	5	e	other
2	A	6		*other*
2	B			*"Classroom training and live immersion training (LET) programs are not always available. Is distributive learning (DL) or technology-delivered training (TDT) a viable option for training language?" Give example if necessary.*
2	B	1		*possible alternatives to traditional training*
2	B	1	a	pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
2	B	1	b	tutoring in specific languages
2	B	1	d	immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site

2	B	1	e	other
2	B	2		*Issues*
2	B	2	a	immersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks.
2	B	2	b	DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them
2	B	2	c	other
2	B	3		*would DL, TDT solutions be effective*
2	B	3	a	maybe a little
2	B	3	c	yes, anything helps
2	B	3	d	other
2	B	4		*other comments about DL,TDT*
2	B	4	a	Rosetta stone program is really helpful
2	B	4	c	other
2	B	5		*DL, TDT not very effective*
2	B	6		*DL, etc. should be more widely available*

2	C			**Issues in proficiency assessment**
2	C	1		*DLPT*
2	C	1	a	Needs to be less military specific
2	C	1	b	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
2	C	1	c	is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
2	C	1	d	needs improvement
2	C	1	e	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
2	C	1	f	other
2	C	1	g	is not a valid measure of usage in the field
2	C	2		*On the need for speaking to be assessed*
2	C	2	a	Needs to incorporate speaking into DLPT some way / Use OPI
2	C	2	d	other comments
2	C	3		*OPI*
2	C	3	a	Is a good test

2	C	3	b	Is too subjective
2	C	3	c	other comments
2	C	5		Other

2	D			**Issues with specific programs**
2	D	1		*DLI Arabic program*
2	D	1	b	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
2	D	1	c	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
2	D	1	e	other comments
2	D	3		*DLI courses in general*
2	D	3	a	Need a greater speaking focus
2	D	3	b	Spend too much time teaching specifically for DLPT
2	D	3	c	other comments
2	D	4		*Berlitz*
2	D	4	a	Korean program had a good emphasis on conversational language which was helpful
2	D	4	b	other comments
2	D	5		*SWC*
2	D	5	a	Not enough focus on military language
2	D	5	b	Not long enough
2	D	5	c	other comments
2	D	6		*other programs*
2	D	6	a	other comments
2				
2	E			**Special Issues with reservists:**
2	E	1		*training timing*
2	E	1	a	should take place right after all other & basic training
2	E	1	b	other comments
2	E	2		*time concerns*
2	E	2	a	during drill weekends, there is no time for language drills

2	E	2	b	going to DLI for a year is not feasible for many/most reservists
2	E	2	c	other comments
2	E	3		*Language requirements*
2	E	3	a	should be required
2	E	3	b	there is no pre-deployment training - it should be required as well.
2	E	3	c	other comments
2	E	4		*pay issues*
2	E	4	a	given lack of time during drills, consider paying people to study on their own time
2	E	4	b	FLPP is really low for reservists
2	E	4	c	FLPP is not a motivator for reservists
2	E	4	d	better FLPP would motivate reservists to study on their own
2	E	4	e	other pay comments
2	E	4	f	should be paid at lower proficiency levels than enlisted persons
2	E	5		*immersion training*
2	E	5	a	there is very little opportunity for immersion in reserves, needs to be more
2	E	5	b	many reservists don't believe immersion is possible for them
2	E	5	c	other
2	E	6		*training options*
2	E	6	a	need a wide range
2	E	6	c	local training programs might be an option
2	E	6	d	very few slots for DLI and other programs are available
2	E	6	e	other
2	E	7		*support from command (or higher levels)*
2	E	7	a	not much
2	E	7	b	some
2	E	7	d	not at all
2	E	8		*technology*
2	E	8	d	other technology-related comments

Appendix D:

Detailed Coding Scheme for Block 3 Comments

Categories

3	A				**Mission language requirement**
3	A	1			**which language skills are relevant**
3	A	1	a		*#1 priority*
3	A	1	a	1	speaking
3	A	1	a	2	listening
3	A	1	a	3	writing
3	A	1	a	4	reading
3	A	1	a	6	other
3	A	1	b		*#2 priority*
3	A	1	b	1	speaking
3	A	1	b	2	listening
3	A	1	b	3	writing
3	A	1	b	4	reading
3	A	1	b	6	other
3	A	1	c		*#3 priority*
3	A	1	c	1	speaking
3	A	1	c	2	listening
3	A	1	c	3	writing
3	A	1	c	4	reading
3	A	1	c	6	other
3	A	1	d		*#4 priority*
3	A	1	d	1	speaking
3	A	1	d	2	listening
3	A	1	d	3	writing
3	A	1	d	4	reading
3	A	1	d	6	other
3	A				**what proficiency levels are needed**
3	A	2			1-1

3	A	3			2-2
3	A	4			3-3
3	A	5			can have a variety within a given unit
3	A	6			other
3	B				**Where training fits into the career lifecycle**
3	B	1			**school training**
3	B	1	a		*when in pipeline?*
3	B	1	a	1	early - as part of some of the first training that occurs
3	B	1	a	2	late but before being sent to unit - just before send off to unit
3	B	1	a	3	very late - after sent to unit (to prevent burnout)
3	B	1	a	4	other
3	B	1	c		*primary emphasis should be?*
3	B	1	c	1	military language
3	B	1	c	2	street language
3	B	1	c	3	equal mix
3	B	1	c	4	other
3	B	3			**maintenance**
3	B	3	a		*type?*
3	B	3	a	1	language lab
3	B	3	a	2	DL
3	B	3	a	3	college classes
3	B	3	a	4	immersion
3	B	3	a	5	classroom (DLI, etc.)
3	B	3	a	6	language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)
3	B	3	a	7	other
3	B	3	b		*how often?*
3	B	3	b	1	weekly
3	B	3	b	3	monthly
3	B	3	b	5	other

3	B	3	b	6	annually
3	B	3	d		*issues in maintenance*
3	B	3	d	2	should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
3	B	3	d	4	other

3	**C**			**The most effective training options for initial acquisition and sustainment/enhancement training**
3	C	1		*for initial acquisition*
3	C	1	a	classroom
3	C	1	b	classroom/immersion combo
3	C	1	c	other
3	C	2		*for sustaining/enhancing*
3	C	2	a	immersion
3	C	2	d	other
3	**D**			**Should training be voluntary or involuntary**
3	D	1		mandatory for all
3	D	3		voluntary
3	D	5		based on aptitude/interest
3	D	6		basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
3	D	8		other

3	**F**			**Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities**
3	F	1		*What are these barriers?*
3	F	1	a	financial costs of training
3	F	1	b	no time for dedicated long period of language training
3	F	1	c	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
3	F	1	d	no language lab
3	F	1	e	low priority for leadership

3	F	1	f	time not being used efficiently
3	F	1	g	other
3	F	1	h	other lack of resources
3	F	1	i	lack of awareness of resources
3	F	1	k	no structured program / maintenance
3	F	2		*How can they be removed?*
3	F	2	a	discretionary language funds for units
3	F	2	b	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
3	F	2	c	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
3	F	2	d	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
3	F	2	e	other
3	G			**What would you recommend to motivate improved language proficiency?**
3	G	1		*pay*
3	G	1	a	pay based on language difficulty
3	G	1	b	no cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated
3	G	1	c	pay separately for proficiency in speaking than in listening/reading comprehension
3	G	1	d	pay based on the number of years you have maintained proficiency
3	G	1	e	more pay using current compensation system
3	G	1	g	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
3	G	1	h	other
3	G	2		*practical use*
3	G	2	a	make sure they will be used in the field
3	G	2	b	other
3	G	3		*recognition*
3	G	3	a	any type
3	G	4		*other*
3	G	4	a	try and select those with prior language exposure
3	G	4	b	other
3	G	4	c	hold people accountable

3	H		**Ways to improve training**
3	H	1	instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
3	H	3	allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
3	H	4	SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
3	H	6	Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
3	H	7	Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
3	H	8	Keep class size small (under 10)
3	H	9	other comments
3	H	10	Make proficiency a requirement to be eligible to deploy
3	H	11	Actually practice training sessions (they will be done down-range) in the native language stateside
3	H	12	CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
3	H	13	Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
3	H	14	other comments
3	H	15	Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
3	H	16	Immersion training is best

Appendix E:

Frequency Results for AF Block 1

Freq	Categories				
	1	A			*Q1: "Tell us about a situation were having language skills and capabilities contributed to mission success?"*
	1	A	1		*Tasks performed?*
5	1	A	1	a	Training others
10	1	A	1	b	Missions
1	1	A	1	c	other
	1	A	2		*Which language was required of the mission:*
4	1	A	2	a	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
5	1	A	2	b	National language
2	1	A	2	c	Specific local dialect
1	1	A	2	d	other
	1	A	3		*Level of proficiency required on the mission*
2	1	A	3	a	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases - listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
3	1	A	3	b	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
6	1	A	3	c	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful
1	1	A	3	e	other
	1	A	5		*How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?*
1	1	A	5	a	Not at all
1	1	A	5	b	A little
2	1	A	5	c	A moderate amount
1	1	A	5	d	A lot
	1	A	6		*Proficiencies needed?*
4	1	A	6	a	General language (around town)
7	1	A	6	b	Technical-job related or military terms
	1	A	6	c	other
	1	A	7		*Which is more important?*

6	1	A	7	a				Speaking
1	1	A	7	b				Reading
	1	A	7	c				Writing
7	1	A	7	d				Listening
1	1	A	7	e				other
	1	A	8					*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
2	1	A	8	b				Helpful but not essential
2	1	A	8	c				Essential
	1	A	8	d				other
	1	A	9					*Do the natives typically speak English*
4	1	A	9	a				Most of them
1	1	A	9	b				Some of them
2	1	A	9	c				Few of them
1	1	A	9	d				None of them
	1	A	11					***Did you use job aids (e.g., Kwikpoint) to help prepare? If yes, what's your evaluation of the job aid?***
	1	A	11	a				**translators/interpreters**
	1	A	11	a	1			*How often*
	1	A	11	a	1	a		yes - local interpreters, frequently
	1	A	11	a	1	b		yes - local interpreters, infrequently
	1	A	11	a	1	c		yes - military provided interpreters, frequently
	1	A	11	a	1	d		yes - military provided interpreters, infrequently
1	1	A	11	a	1	e		rarely used interpreters
	1	A	11	a	2			*How important is it to use interpreters*
1	1	A	11	a	2	a		Essential
2	1	A	11	a	2	b		Helpful
	1	A	11	a	2	c		Of little use
	1	A	11	a	3			*Issues in selecting interpreter*

	1	A	11	a	3	a	Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
	1	A	11	a	3	b	Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
	1	A	11	a	3	c	As long as they speak English their OK
	1	A	11	a	3	d	Proper selection interpreters is important
	1	A	11	a	3	f	Can't trust interpreters
1	1	A	11	a	3	g	other interpreter issues
	1	A	11	d			**Note cards with phrases**
	1	A	11	d	1		sometime
	1	A	11	d	2		always
	1	A	11	d	3		other
	1	A	11	e			**jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal**
	1	A	11	e	1		on occasion
	1	A	11	F			**other**
	1	C					*General Themes:*
	1	C	1				*Additional Language Training Needs*
1	1	C	1	a			Spoken
	1	C	1	b			Written
1	1	C	1	d			Street/slang
1	1	C	1	e			Formal/presentation language
1	1	C	1	f			Flexibility - broad range of skills
	1	C	1	g			Cultural language training
	1	C	1	h			Cultural non-verbal language training
1	1	C	1	i			Dialect Training
	1	C	1	j			Immersion training
	1	C	1	k			More time in formal classes
3	1	C	1	n			Other
	1	C	2				*Benefits of proficiency:*

	1	C	2	a			*Basic*
1	1	C	2	a	1		Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
1	1	C	2	a	2		Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
1	1	C	2	a	3		Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	1	C	2	b			*More advanced*
1	1	C	2	b	2		Identifying important documents in another language
1	1	C	2	b	3		Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
1	1	C	2	b	4		Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
	1	C	2	b	5		other
	1	C	2	c			*Unspecified*
5	1	C	2	c	1		Builds rapport/trust
5	1	C	2	c	2		Enhances communication effectiveness
1	1	C	2	c	3		Increases efficiency/speed of mission
2	1	C	2	c	5		Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
5	1	C	2	c	6		Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
1	1	C	2	c	7		Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
2	1	C	2	c	8		Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
	1	C	2	D			other
	1	C	3				***Consequences of a lack of proficiency:***
3	1	C	3	a			Can be dangerous
2	1	C	3	b			May causes mission abort/failure
2	1	C	3	c			May slow mission
3	1	C	3	d			May decrease mission effectiveness
	1	C	3	e			May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)
	1	C	3	f			Can lead to selection of inappropriate translator
2	1	D					***Other comments:***
5	4						***incomplete data - not able to code in any block***

Appendix F:

Frequency Results for AF Block 2

Freq	Categories			
	2	A		**General issues in training effectiveness**
	2	A	1	*with immersion*
	2	A	1 a	timing (too long before deployment)
	2	A	1 b	immersed with others or by self
5	2	A	1 d	cultural aspect of immersion is important
2	2	A	1 f	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
1	2	A	1 g	other
	2	A	2	*that contribute to a lack of preparation*
	2	A	2 a	missions in many locations
	2	A	2 b	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
	2	A	2 c	other
	2	A	3	*tools to use in training/preparation*
1	2	A	3 a	reading - to build vocabulary
2	2	A	3 b	language labs are very valuable
	2	A	3 c	other
	2	A	5	*Why do people learn languages*
2	2	A	5 a	Current pay is not a strong motivator
2	2	A	5 b	Pride / wanting to do a better job
	2	A	5 c	To make missions easier on themselves
	2	A	5 d	Pay
	2	A	5 e	other
	2	A	6	*other*
	2	B		*"Classroom training and live emersion training (LET) programs are not always available. Is distributive learning (DL) or technology-delivered training (TDT) a viable option for training language?" Give example if necessary.*
	2	B	1	*possible alternatives to traditional training*

	2	B	1	a	pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
1	2	B	1	b	tutoring in specific languages
	2	B	1	d	immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site
1	2	B	1	e	other
	2	B	2		*Issues*
1	2	B	2	a	immersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks.
	2	B	2	b	DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them
	2	B	2	c	other
	2	B	3		*would DL, TDT solutions be effective*
	2	B	3	a	maybe a little
	2	B	3	c	yes, anything helps
	2	B	3	d	other
	2	B	4		*other comments about DL, TDT*
	2	B	4	a	Rosetta stone program is really helpful
	2	B	4	c	other
4	2	B	5		*DL, TDT not very effective*
	2	B	6		*DL, etc. should be more widely available*

	2	**C**			**Issues in proficiency assessment**
	2	C	1		*DPLT*
1	2	C	1	a	Needs to be less military specific
1	2	C	1	b	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
2	2	C	1	c	is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
2	2	C	1	d	needs improvement
1	2	C	1	e	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
1	2	C	1	f	other
1	2	C	1	g	is not a valid measure of usage in the field

	2	C	2		*On the need for speaking to be assessed*
	2	C	2	a	Needs to incorporate speaking into DPLT some way / Use OPI
4	2	C	2	d	other comments
	2	C	3		*OPI*
2	2	C	3	a	Is a good test
1	2	C	3	b	Is too subjective
1	2	C	3	c	other comments
1	2	C	5		Other

	2	**D**			**Issues with specific programs**
	2	D	1		*DLI Arabic program*
1	2	D	1	b	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
	2	D	1	c	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
1	2	D	1	e	other comments
	2	D	3		*DLI courses in general*
	2	D	3	a	Need a greater speaking focus
	2	D	3	b	Spend too much time teaching specifically for DPLT
	2	D	3	c	other comments
	2	D	4		*Berlitz*
	2	D	4	a	Korean program had a good emphasis on conversational language which was helpful
3	2	D	4	b	other comments
	2	D	5		*SWC*
	2	D	5	a	Not enough focus on military language
	2	D	5	b	Not long enough
	2	D	5	c	other comments
	2	D	6		*other programs*
	2	D	6	a	other comments

2

2	E			**Special Issues with reservists:**
2	E	1		*training timing*
2	E	1	a	should take place right after all other & basic training
2	E	1	b	other comments
2	E	2		*time concerns*
2	E	2	a	during drill weekends, there is no time for language drills
2	E	2	b	going to DLI for a year is not feasible for many/most reservists
2	E	2	c	other comments
2	E	3		*Language requirements*
2	E	3	a	should be required
2	E	3	b	there is no pre-deployment training - it should be required as well.
2	E	3	c	other comments
2	E	4		*pay issues*
2	E	4	a	given lack of time during drills, consider paying people to study on their own time
2	E	4	b	FLPP is really low for reservists
2	E	4	c	FLPP is not a motivator for reservists
2	E	4	d	better FLPP would motivate reservists to study on their own
2	E	4	e	other pay comments
2	E	4	f	should be paid at lower proficiency levels than enlisted persons
2	E	5		*immersion training*
2	E	5	a	there is very little opportunity for emersion in reserves, needs to be more
2	E	5	b	many reservists don't believe immersion is possible for them
2	E	5	c	other
2	E	6		*training options*
2	E	6	a	need a wide range
2	E	6	c	local training programs might be an option

2	E	6	d	very few slots for DLI and other programs are available
2	E	6	e	other
2	E	7		*support from command (or higher levels)*
2	E	7	a	not much
2	E	7	b	some
2	E	7	d	not at all
2	E	8		*technology*
2	E	8	d	other technology-related comments

Appendix G:

Frequency Results for AF Block 3

Freq	Categories					
	3	A				**Mission language requirement**
	3	A	1			**which language skills are relevant**
	3	A	1	a		*#1 priority*
4	3	A	1	a	1	speaking
4	3	A	1	a	2	listening
1	3	A	1	a	3	writing
	3	A	1	a	4	reading
	3	A	1	a	6	other
	3	A	1	b		*#2 priority*
	3	A	1	b	1	speaking
1	3	A	1	b	2	listening
	3	A	1	b	3	writing
	3	A	1	b	4	reading
1	3	A	1	b	6	other
	3	A	1	c		*#3 priority*
	3	A	1	c	1	speaking
	3	A	1	c	2	listening
	3	A	1	c	3	writing
	3	A	1	c	4	reading
	3	A	1	c	6	other
	3	A	1	d		*#4 priority*
	3	A	1	d	1	speaking
	3	A	1	d	2	listening
	3	A	1	d	3	writing
	3	A	1	d	4	reading
	3	A	1	d	6	other

	3	A					**what proficiency levels are needed**
	3	A	2				1-1
	3	A	3				2-2
1	3	A	4				3-3
1	3	A	5				can have a variety within a given unit
	3	A	6				other
	3	**B**					**Where training fits into the career lifecycle**
	3	B	1				**school training**
	3	B	1	a			*when in pipeline?*
2	3	B	1	a	1		early - as part of some of the first training that occurs
1	3	B	1	a	2		late but before being sent to unit - just before send off to unit
1	3	B	1	a	3		very late - after sent to unit (to prevent burnout)
	3	B	1	a	4		other
	3	B	1	c			*primary emphasis should be?*
	3	B	1	c	1		military language
1	3	B	1	c	2		street language
	3	B	1	c	3		equal mix
1	3	B	1	c	4		other
	3	B	3				**maintenance**
	3	B	3	a			*type?*
1	3	B	3	a	1		language lab
1	3	B	3	a	2		DL
	3	B	3	a	3		college classes
4	3	B	3	a	4		immersion
3	3	B	3	a	5		classroom (DLI, etc.)
	3	B	3	a	6		language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)
1	3	B	3	a	7		other

	3	B	3	b		*how often?*
2	3	B	3	b	1	weekly
1	3	B	3	b	3	monthly
	3	B	3	b	5	other
4	3	B	3	b	6	annually
	3	B	3	d		*issues in maintenance*
	3	B	3	d	2	should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
	3	B	3	d	4	other
	3	**C**				**The most effective training options for initial acquisition and sustainment/enhancement training**
	3	C	1			*for initial acquisition*
4	3	C	1	a		classroom
1	3	C	1	b		classroom/immersion combo
1	3	C	1	c		other
	3	C	2			*for sustaining/enhancing*
2	3	C	2	a		immersion
2	3	C	2	d		other
	3	**D**				**Should training be voluntary or involuntary**
3	3	D	1			mandatory for all
	3	D	3			voluntary
	3	D	5			based on aptitude/interest
	3	D	6			basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
	3	D	8			other
	3	**F**				**Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities**
	3	F	1			*What are these barriers?*
7	3	F	1	a		financial costs of training
8	3	F	1	b		no time for dedicated long period of language training

3	3	F	1	c	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
	3	F	1	d	no language lab
	3	F	1	e	low priority for leadership
	3	F	1	f	time not being used efficiently
3	3	F	1	g	other
1	3	F	1	h	other lack of resources
	3	F	1	i	lack of awareness of resources
	3	F	1	k	no structured program/maintenance
	3	F	2		*How can they be removed?*
1	3	F	2	a	discretionary language funds for units
3	3	F	2	b	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
	3	F	2	c	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
	3	F	2	d	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
1	3	F	2	e	other
	3	G			**What would you recommend to motivate improved language proficiency?**
	3	G	1		*pay*
2	3	G	1	a	pay based on language difficulty
	3	G	1	b	no cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated
	3	G	1	c	pay separately for proficiency in speaking than in listening/reading comprehension
	3	G	1	d	pay based on the number of years you have maintained proficiency
	3	G	1	e	more pay using current compensation system
	3	G	1	g	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
1	3	G	1	h	other
	3	G	2		*practical use*
2	3	G	2	a	make sure they will be used in the field
	3	G	2	b	other
	3	G	3		*recognition*

	3	G	3	a	any type
	3	G	4		*other*
4	3	G	4	a	try and select those with prior language exposure
	3	G	4	b	other
	3	G	4	c	hold people accountable
	3	H			**Ways to improve training**
1	3	H	1		instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
	3	H	3		allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
	3	H	4		SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
	3	H	6		Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
	3	H	7		Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
	3	H	8		Keep class size small (under 10)
3	3	H	9		other comments
	3	H	10		Make proficiency a requirement to be eligible to deploy
	3	H	11		Actually practice training sessions (they will be done down-range) in the native language stateside
	3	H	12		CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
	3	H	13		Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
	3	H	14		other comments
2	3	H	15		Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
	3	H	16		Imersion training is best

Appendix H:

Frequency Results for SF Active Duty Block 1

Freq	Categories				
	1	A			**Q1: "Tell us about a situation were having language skills and capabilities contributed to mission success?"**
	1	A	1		*Tasks performed?*
14	1	A	1	a	Training others
4	1	A	1	b	Missions
1	1	A	1	c	other
	1	A	2		*Which language was required of the mission:*
13	1	A	2	a	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
5	1	A	2	b	National language
13	1	A	2	c	Specific local dialect
1	1	A	2	d	other
	1	A	3		*Level of proficiency required on the mission*
4	1	A	3	a	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases - listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
4	1	A	3	b	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
2	1	A	3	c	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful
1	1	A	3	e	other
	1	A	5		*How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?*
4	1	A	5	a	Not at all
2	1	A	5	b	A little
1	1	A	5	c	A moderate amount
1	1	A	5	d	A lot
	1	A	6		*Proficiencies needed?*
6	1	A	6	a	General language (around town)
7	1	A	6	b	Technical-job related or military terms
3	1	A	6	c	other
	1	A	7		*Which is more important?*

13	1	A	7	a					Speaking
0	1	A	7	b					Reading
0	1	A	7	c					Writing
5	1	A	7	d					Listening
2	1	A	7	e					other
	1	A	8						*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
1	1	A	8	b					Helpful but not essential
2	1	A	8	c					Essential
1	1	A	8	d					other
	1	A	9						*Do the natives typically speak English*
1	1	A	9	a					Most of them
3	1	A	9	b					Some of them
0	1	A	9	c					Few of them
3	1	A	9	d					None of them
	1	A	11						***Did you use job aids (e.g., Kwikpoint) to help prepare? If yes, what's your evaluation of the job aid?***
3	1	A	11	a					**translators/interpreters**
1	1	A	11	a	1				*How often*
2	1	A	11	a	1	a			yes - local interpreters, frequently
1	1	A	11	a	1	b			yes - local interpreters, infrequently
6	1	A	11	a	1	c			yes - military provided interpreters, frequently
1	1	A	11	a	1	d			yes - military provided interpreters, infrequently
1	1	A	11	a	1	e			rarely used interpreters
	1	A	11	a	2				*How important is it to use interpreters*
7	1	A	11	a	2	a			Essential
0	1	A	11	a	2	b			Helpful
1	1	A	11	a	2	c			Of little use
	1	A	11	a	3				*Issues in selecting interpreter*

6	1	A	11	a	3	a		Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
2	1	A	11	a	3	b		Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
1	1	A	11	a	3	c		As long as they speak English their OK
3	1	A	11	a	3	d		Proper selection interpreters is important
6	1	A	11	a	3	f		Can't trust interpreters
	1	A	11	a	3	g		other interpreter issues
0	1	A	11	d				**Note cards with phrases**
0	1	A	11	d	1			sometime
0	1	A	11	d	2			always
0	1	A	11	d	3			other
	1	A	11	e				**jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal**
7	1	A	11	e	1			on occasion
6	1	A	11	F			**other**	
	1	C					*General Themes:*	
	1	C	1				*Additional Language Training Needs*	
2	1	C	1	a			Spoken	
1	1	C	1	b			Written	
11	1	C	1	d			Street/slang	
2	1	C	1	e			Formal/presentation language	
0	1	C	1	f			Flexibility - broad range of skills	
3	1	C	1	g			Cultural language training	
3	1	C	1	h			Cultural non-verbal language training	
2	1	C	1	1			Dialect Training	
7	1	C	1	j			Immersion training	
1	1	C	1	k			More time in formal classes	
2	1	C	1	n			Other	
	1	C	2				*Benefits of proficiency:*	

	1	C	2	a		*Basic*
0	1	C	2	a	1	Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
5	1	C	2	a	2	Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
2	1	C	2	a	3	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	1	C	2	b		*More advanced*
0	1	C	2	b	2	Identifying important documents in another language
0	1	C	2	b	3	Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
2	1	C	2	b	4	Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
1	1	C	2	b	5	other
	1	C	2	c		*Unspecified*
14	1	C	2	c	1	Builds rapport/trust
4	1	C	2	c	2	Enhances communication effectiveness
0	1	C	2	c	3	Increases efficiency/speed of mission
3	1	C	2	c	5	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
1	1	C	2	c	6	Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
0	1	C	2	c	7	Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
2	1	C	2	c	8	Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
1	1	C	2	D		other
	1	C	3			***Consequences of a lack of proficiency:***
5	1	C	3	a		Can be dangerous
1	1	C	3	b		May causes mission abort/failure
5	1	C	3	c		May slow mission
9	1	C	3	d		May decrease mission effectiveness
1	1	C	3	e		May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)
	1	C	3	f		Can lead to selection of inappropriate translator
29	1	D				***Other comments:***
39	4					***incomplete data - not able to code (all blocks)***

Appendix I:

Frequency Results for SF Reserve Duty Block 1

Freq	Categories				
	1	A			*Q1: "Tell us about a situation were having language skills and capabilities contributed to mission success?"*
	1	A	1		*Tasks performed?*
1	1	A	1	a	Training others
0	1	A	1	b	Missions
0	1	A	1	c	other
	1	A	2		*Which language was required of the mission:*
3	1	A	2	a	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
0	1	A	2	b	National language
2	1	A	2	c	Specific local dialect
0	1	A	2	d	other
	1	A	3		*Level of proficiency required on the mission*
1	1	A	3	a	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases - listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
0	1	A	3	b	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
0	1	A	3	c	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful
0	1	A	3	e	other
	1	A	5		*How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?*
0	1	A	5	a	Not at all
0	1	A	5	b	A little
0	1	A	5	c	A moderate amount
2	1	A	5	d	A lot
	1	A	6		*Proficiencies needed?*
0	1	A	6	a	General language (around town)
2	1	A	6	b	Technical-job related or military terms
0	1	A	6	c	other
	1	A	7		*Which is more important?*

5	1	A	7	a				Speaking
1	1	A	7	b				Reading
0	1	A	7	c				Writing
5	1	A	7	d				Listening
0	1	A	7	e				other
	1	A	8					*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
1	1	A	8	b				Helpful but not essential
0	1	A	8	c				Essential
0	1	A	8	d				other
	1	A	9					*Do the natives typically speak English*
0	1	A	9	a				Most of them
0	1	A	9	b				Some of them
0	1	A	9	c				Few of them
0	1	A	9	d				None of them
	1	A	11					***Did you use job aids (e.g., Kwikpoint) to help prepare? If yes, what's your evaluation of the job aid?***
	1	A	11	a				**translators/interpreters**
	1	A	11	a	1			*How often*
2	1	A	11	a	1	a		yes - local interpreters, frequently
0	1	A	11	a	1	b		yes - local interpreters, infrequently
1	1	A	11	a	1	c		yes - military provided interpreters, frequently
0	1	A	11	a	1	d		yes - military provided interpreters, infrequently
0	1	A	11	a	1	e		rarely used interpreters
	1	A	11	a	2			*How important is it to use interpreters*
0	1	A	11	a	2	a		Essential
0	1	A	11	a	2	b		Helpful
0	1	A	11	a	2	c		Of little use
	1	A	11	a	3			*Issues in selecting interpreter*

3	1	A	11	a	3	a		Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
0	1	A	11	a	3	b		Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
0	1	A	11	a	3	c		As long as they speak English their OK
1	1	A	11	a	3	d		Proper selection interpreters is important
0	1	A	11	a	3	f		Can't trust interpreters
0	1	A	11	a	3	g		other interpreter issues
	1	A	11	d				**Note cards with phrases**
0	1	A	11	d	1			sometime
0	1	A	11	d	2			always
0	1	A	11	d	3			other
	1	A	11	e				**jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal**
1	1	A	11	e	1			on occasion
1	1	A	11	F				**other**
	1	C						*General Themes:*
	1	C	1					*Additional Language Training Needs*
0	1	C	1	a				Spoken
0	1	C	1	b				Written
1	1	C	1	d				Street/slang
0	1	C	1	e				Formal/presentation language
0	1	C	1	f				Flexibility - broad range of skills
0	1	C	1	g				Cultural language training
0	1	C	1	h				Cultural non-verbal language training
0	1	C	1	i				Dialect Training
1	1	C	1	j				Immersion training
0	1	C	1	k				More time in formal classes
0	1	C	1	n				Other
	1	C	2					*Benefits of proficiency:*

	1	C	2	a			*Basic*
2	1	C	2	a	1		Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
0	1	C	2	a	2		Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
3	1	C	2	a	3		Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	1	C	2	b			*More advanced*
1	1	C	2	b	2		Identifying important documents in another language
0	1	C	2	b	3		Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
0	1	C	2	b	4		Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
0	1	C	2	b	5		other
	1	C	2	c			*Unspecified*
4	1	C	2	c	1		Builds rapport/trust
0	1	C	2	c	2		Enhances communication effectiveness
3	1	C	2	c	3		Increases efficiency/speed of mission
0	1	C	2	c	5		Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
0	1	C	2	c	6		Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
0	1	C	2	c	7		Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
0	1	C	2	c	8		Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
0	1	C	2	D			other
	1	C	3				**Consequences of a lack of proficiency:**
0	1	C	3	a			Can be dangerous
0	1	C	3	b			May causes mission abort/failure
1	1	C	3	c			May slow mission
3	1	C	3	d			May decrease mission effectiveness
0	1	C	3	e			May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)
3	1	C	3	f			Can lead to selection of inappropriate translator
1	1	D					**Other comments:**
	4						***incomplete data - not able to code (for all blocks)***

Appendix J:

Frequency Results for SF Active Duty Block 2

Freq	Categories				
	2	A			**General issues in training effectiveness**
	2	A	1		*with immersion*
1	2	A	1	a	timing (too long before deployment)
6	2	A	1	b	immersed with others or by self
1	2	A	1	d	cultural aspect of immersion is important
2	2	A	1	f	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
9	2	A	1	g	other
	2	A	2		*that contribute to a lack of preparation*
1	2	A	2	a	missions in many locations
3	2	A	2	b	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
2	2	A	2	c	other
	II	A	3		*tools to use in training/preparation*
	II	A	3	a	reading - to build vocabulary
	II	A	3	b	language labs are very valuable
	II	A	3	c	other
	2	A	5		*Why do people learn languages*
0	2	A	5	a	Current pay is not a strong motivator
0	2	A	5	b	Pride / wanting to do a better job
2	2	A	5	c	To make missions easier on themselves
0	2	A	5	d	Pay
1	2	A	5	e	other
5	2	A	6		*other*
	2	B			*"Classroom training and live emersion training (LET) programs are not always available. Is distributive learning (DL) or technology-delivered training (TDT) a viable option for training language?" Give example if necessary.*
	2	B	1		*possible alternatives to traditional training*

1	2	B	1	a	pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
0	2	B	1	b	tutoring in specific languages
5	2	B	1	d	immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site
8	2	B	1	e	other
	2	B	2		*Issues*
1	2	B	2	a	immersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks.
3	2	B	2	b	DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them
	2	B	2	c	other
	2	B	3		*would DL, TDT solutions be effective*
1	2	B	3	a	maybe a little
2	2	B	3	c	yes, anything helps
1	2	B	3	d	other
	2	B	4		*other comments about DL, TDT*
0	2	B	4	a	Rosetta stone program is really helpful
2	2	B	4	c	other
	2	B	5		*DL, TDT not very effective*
	2	B	6		*DL, etc. should be more widely available*

	2	C			**Issues in proficiency assessment**
	2	C	1		*DPLT*
0	2	C	1	a	Needs to be less military specific
2	2	C	1	b	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
0	2	C	1	c	is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
12	2	C	1	d	needs improvement
4	2	C	1	e	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
10	2	C	1	f	other
2	2	C	1	g	is not a valid measure of usage in the field

	2	C	2		*On the need for speaking to be assessed*
13	2	C	2	a	Needs to incorporate speaking into DPLT some way / Use OPI
2	2	C	2	d	other comments
	2	C	3		*OPI*
2	2	C	3	a	Is a good test
0	2	C	3	b	Is too subjective
3	2	C	3	c	other comments
	2	C	5		Other

	2	D			**Issues with specific programs**
	2	D	1		*DLI Arabic program*
0	2	D	1	b	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
0	2	D	1	c	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
0	2	D	1	e	other comments
	2	D	3		*DLI courses in general*
4	2	D	3	a	Need a greater speaking focus
4	2	D	3	b	Spend too much time teaching specifically for DPLT
7	2	D	3	c	other comments
	2	D	4		*Berlitz*
0	2	D	4	a	Korean program had a good emphasis on conversational language which was helpful
2	2	D	4	b	other comments
	2	D	5		*SWC*
2	2	D	5	a	Not enough focus on military language
0	2	D	5	b	Not long enough
9	2	D	5	c	other comments
	2	D	6		*other programs*
6	2	D	6	a	other comments

2

2	E			**Special Issues with reservists:**
2	E	1		*training timing*
2	E	1	a	should take place right after all other & basic training
2	E	1	b	other comments
2	E	2		*time concerns*
2	E	2	a	during drill weekends, there is no time for language drills
2	E	2	b	going to DLI for a year is not feasible for many/most reservists
2	E	2	c	other comments
2	E	3		*Language requirements*
2	E	3	a	should be required
2	E	3	b	there is no pre-deployment training - it should be required as well.
2	E	3	c	other comments
2	E	4		*pay issues*
2	E	4	a	given lack of time during drills, consider paying people to study on their own time
2	E	4	b	FLPP is really low for reservists
2	E	4	c	FLPP is not a motivator for reservists
2	E	4	d	better FLPP would motivate reservists to study on their own
2	E	4	e	other pay comments
2	E	4	f	should be paid at lower proficiency levels than enlisted persons
2	E	5		*immersion training*
2	E	5	a	there is very little opportunity for emersion in reserves, needs to be more
2	E	5	b	many reservists don't believe immersion is possible for them
2	E	5	c	other
2	E	6		*training options*
2	E	6	a	need a wide range
2	E	6	c	local training programs might be an option

2 E 6 d   very few slots for DLI and other programs are available

2 E 6 e   other

2 E 7   *support from command (or higher levels)*

2 E 7 a   not much

2 E 7 b   some

2 E 7 d   not at all

2 E 8   *technology*

2 E 8 d   other technology-related comments

Appendix K:

Frequency Results for SF Reserve Duty Block 2

Freq	Categories				
	2	A			**General issues in training effectiveness**
	2	A	1		*with immersion*
0	2	A	1	a	timing (too long before deployment)
0	2	A	1	b	immersed with others or by self
6	2	A	1	d	cultural aspect of immersion is important
2	2	A	1	f	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
0	2	A	1	g	other
	2	A	2		*that contribute to a lack of preparation*
0	2	A	2	a	missions in many locations
0	2	A	2	b	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
0	2	A	2	c	other
	2	A	3		*tools to use in training/preparation*
2	2	A	3	a	reading - to build vocabulary
3	2	A	3	b	language labs are very valuable
0	2	A	3	c	other
	2	A	5		*Why do people learn languages*
0	2	A	5	a	Current pay is not a strong motivator
2	2	A	5	b	Pride / wanting to do a better job
1	2	A	5	c	To make missions easier on themselves
0	2	A	5	d	Pay
0	2	A	5	e	other
	2	A	6		*other*
	2	B			*"Classroom training and live emersion training (LET) programs are not always available. Is distributive learning (DL) or technology-delivered training (TDT) a viable option for training language?" Give example if necessary.*
	2	B	1		*possible alternatives to traditional training*

0	2	B	1	a	pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
0	2	B	1	b	tutoring in specific languages
1	2	B	1	d	immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site
3	2	B	1	e	other
	2	B	2		*Issues*
0	2	B	2	a	immersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks.
0	2	B	2	b	DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them
0	2	B	2	c	other
	2	B	3		*would DL, TDT solutions be effective*
0	2	B	3	a	maybe a little
0	2	B	3	c	yes, anything helps
0	2	B	3	d	other
	2	B	4		*other comments about DL,TDT*
1	2	B	4	a	Rosetta stone program is really helpful
0	2	B	4	c	other
0	2	B	5		*DL, TDT not very effective*
0	2	B	6		*DL, etc. should be more widely available*

	2	C			**Issues in proficiency assessment**
	2	C	1		*DPLT*
0	2	C	1	a	Needs to be less military specific
0	2	C	1	b	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
0	2	C	1	c	is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
2	2	C	1	d	needs improvement
0	2	C	1	e	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
0	2	C	1	f	other
0	2	C	1	g	is not a valid measure of usage in the field

	2	C	2		*On the need for speaking to be assessed*
0	2	C	2	a	Needs to incorporate speaking into DPLT some way / Use OPI
0	2	C	2	d	other comments
	2	C	3		*OPI*
0	2	C	3	a	Is a good test
0	2	C	3	b	Is too subjective
0	2	C	3	c	other comments
	2	C	5		Other

	2	D			**Issues with specific programs**
	2	D	1		*DLI Arabic program*
0	2	D	1	b	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
0	2	D	1	c	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
0	2	D	1	e	other comments
	2	D	3		*DLI courses in general*
1	2	D	3	a	Need a greater speaking focus
0	2	D	3	b	Spend too much time teaching specifically for DPLT
0	2	D	3	c	other comments
	2	D	4		*Berlitz*
0	2	D	4	a	Korean program had a good emphasis on conversational language which was helpful
0	2	D	4	b	other comments
	2	D	5		*SWC*
0	2	D	5	a	Not enough focus on military language
0	2	D	5	b	Not long enough
0	2	D	5	c	other comments
	2	D	6		*other programs*
1	2	D	6	a	other comments

	2				
	2	E			**Special Issues with reservists:**
	2	E	1		*training timing*
0	2	E	1	a	should take place right after all other & basic training
0	2	E	1	b	other comments
	2	E	2		*time concerns*
1	2	E	2	a	during drill weekends, there is no time for language drills
0	2	E	2	b	going to DLI for a year is not feasible for many/most reservists
1	2	E	2	c	other comments
	2	E	3		*Language requirements*
0	2	E	3	a	should be required
0	2	E	3	b	there is no pre-deployment training - it should be required as well.
0	2	E	3	c	other comments
	2	E	4		*pay issues*
0	2	E	4	a	given lack of time during drills, consider paying people to study on their own time
1	2	E	4	b	FLPP is really low for reservists
0	2	E	4	c	FLPP is not a motivator for reservists
0	2	E	4	d	better FLPP would motivate reservists to study on their own
0	2	E	4	e	other pay comments
0	2	E	4	f	should be paid at lower proficiency levels than enlisted persons
	2	E	5		*immersion training*
0	2	E	5	a	there is very little opportunity for emersion in reserves, needs to be more
0	2	E	5	b	many reservists don't believe immersion is possible for them
0	2	E	5	c	other
	2	E	6		*training options*
0	2	E	6	a	need a wide range
0	2	E	6	c	local training programs might be an option

0	2	E	6	d	very few slots for DLI and other programs are available
0	2	E	6	e	other
	2	E	7		*support from command (or higher levels)*
0	2	E	7	a	not much
0	2	E	7	b	some
0	2	E	7	d	not at all
	2	E	8		*technology*
1	2	E	8	d	other technology-related comments

Appendix L:

Frequency Results for SF Active Duty Block 3

Freq	Categories					
	3	A				**Mission language requirement**
	3	A	1			**which language skills are relevant**
	3	A	1	a		*#1 priority*
12	3	A	1	a	1	speaking
5	3	A	1	a	2	listening
0	3	A	1	a	3	writing
0	3	A	1	a	4	reading
0	3	A	1	a	6	other
	3	A	1	b		*#2 priority*
0	3	A	1	b	1	speaking
5	3	A	1	b	2	listening
0	3	A	1	b	3	writing
1	3	A	1	b	4	reading
0	3	A	1	b	6	other
	3	A	1	c		*#3 priority*
0	3	A	1	c	1	speaking
0	3	A	1	c	2	listening
0	3	A	1	c	3	writing
3	3	A	1	c	4	reading
0	3	A	1	c	6	other
	3	A	1	d		*#4 priority*
0	3	A	1	d	1	speaking
0	3	A	1	d	2	listening
3	3	A	1	d	3	writing
0	3	A	1	d	4	reading

0	3	A	1	d	6	other
	3	A				**what proficiency levels are needed**
3	3	A	2			1-1
2	3	A	3			2-2
2	3	A	4			3-3
2	3	A	5			can have a variety within a given unit
9	3	A	6			other
	3	B				**Where training fits into the career lifecycle**
	3	B	1			**school training**
	3	B	1	a		*when in pipeline?*
3	3	B	1	a	1	early - as part of some of the first training that occurs
2	3	B	1	a	2	late but before being sent to unit - just before send off to unit
4	3	B	1	a	3	very late - after sent to unit (to prevent burnout)
2	3	B	1	a	4	other
1	3	B	1	c		*primary emphasis should be?*
4	3	B	1	c	1	military language
3	3	B	1	c	2	street language
3	3	B	1	c	3	equal mix
0	3	B	1	c	4	other
	3	B	3			**maintenance**
	3	B	3	a		*type?*
1	3	B	3	a	1	language lab
1	3	B	3	a	2	DL
1	3	B	3	a	3	college classes
12	3	B	3	a	4	immersion
5	3	B	3	a	5	classroom (DLI, etc.)
5	3	B	3	a	6	language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)

6	3	B	3	a	7		other
	3	B	3	b			*how often?*
1	3	B	3	b	1		weekly
1	3	B	3	b	3		monthly
5	3	B	3	b	5		other
1	3	B	3	b	6		annually
	3	B	3	d			*issues in maintenance*
0	3	B	3	d	2		should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
1	3	B	3	d	4		other

	3	C			**The most effective training options for initial acquisition and sustainment/enhancement training**
	3	C	1		*for initial acquisition*
2	3	C	1	a	classroom
8	3	C	1	b	classroom/immersion combo
6	3	C	1	c	other
	3	C	2		*for sustaining/enhancing*
4	3	C	2	a	immersion
6	3	C	2	d	other
	3	D			**Should training be voluntary or involuntary**
8	3	D	1		mandatory for all
0	3	D	3		voluntary
3	3	D	5		based on aptitude/interest
4	3	D	6		basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
3	3	D	8		other
	3	F			**Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities**
	3	F	1		*What are these barriers?*
5	3	F	1	a	financial costs of training

19	3	F	1	b	no time for dedicated long period of language training
6	3	F	1	c	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
0	3	F	1	d	no language lab
9	3	F	1	e	low priority for leadership
2	3	F	1	f	time not being used efficiently
10	3	F	1	g	other
4	3	F	1	h	other lack of resources
0	3	F	1	i	lack of awareness of resources
0	3	F	1	k	no structured program / maintenance
	3	F	2		*How can they be removed?*
0	3	F	2	a	discretionary language funds for units
6	3	F	2	b	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
2	3	F	2	c	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
2	3	F	2	d	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
8	3	F	2	e	other
	3	G			**What would you recommend to motivate improved language proficiency?**
	3	G	1		*pay*
2	3	G	1	a	pay based on language difficulty
0	3	G	1	b	no cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated
0	3	G	1	c	pay separately for proficiency in speaking than in listening/reading comprehension
0	3	G	1	d	pay based on the number of years you have maintained proficiency
2	3	G	1	e	more pay using current compensation system
4	3	G	1	g	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
6	3	G	1	h	other
	3	G	2		*practical use*
0	3	G	2	a	make sure they will be used in the field
2	3	G	2	b	other

	3	G	3		*recognition*
1	3	G	3	a	any type
	3	G	4		*other*
1	3	G	4	a	try and select those with prior language exposure
9	3	G	4	b	other
2	3	G	4	c	hold people accountable
	3	H			**Ways to improve training**
	3	H	1		instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
	3	H	3		allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
	3	H	4		SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
	3	H	6		Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
	3	H	7		Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
	3	H	8		Keep class size small (under 10)
	3	H	9		other comments
	3	H	10		Make proficiency a requirement to be eligible to deploy
	3	H	11		Actually practice training sessions (they will be done down-range) in the native language stateside
	3	H	12		CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
	3	H	13		Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
1	3	H	14		other comments
	3	H	15		Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
1	3	H	16		Imersion training is best

Appendix M:

Frequency Results for SF Reserve Duty Block 3

Freq	Categories					
	3	A				**Mission language requirement**
	3	A	1			**which language skills are relevant**
1	3	A	1	a		*#1 priority*
3	3	A	1	a	1	speaking
4	3	A	1	a	2	listening
0	3	A	1	a	3	writing
0	3	A	1	a	4	reading
0	3	A	1	a	6	other
	3	A	1	b		*#2 priority*
0	3	A	1	b	1	speaking
1	3	A	1	b	2	listening
0	3	A	1	b	3	writing
0	3	A	1	b	4	reading
0	3	A	1	b	6	other
	3	A	1	c		*#3 priority*
0	3	A	1	c	1	speaking
0	3	A	1	c	2	listening
0	3	A	1	c	3	writing
0	3	A	1	c	4	reading
0	3	A	1	c	6	other
	3	A	1	d		*#4 priority*
0	3	A	1	d	1	speaking
0	3	A	1	d	2	listening
0	3	A	1	d	3	writing
0	3	A	1	d	4	reading

0	3	A	1 d 6	other
	3	A		**what proficiency levels are needed**
2	3	A	2	1-1
0	3	A	3	2-2
0	3	A	4	3-3
0	3	A	5	can have a variety within a given unit
0	3	A	6	other
	3	B		**Where training fits into the career lifecycle**
	3	B	1	**school training**
1	3	B	1 a	*when in pipeline?*
3	3	B	1 a 1	early - as part of some of the first training that occurs
1	3	B	1 a 2	late but before being sent to unit – just before send off to unit
0	3	B	1 a 3	very late - after sent to unit (to prevent burnout)
0	3	B	1 a 4	other
	3	B	1 c	*primary emphasis should be?*
0	3	B	1 c 1	military language
1	3	B	1 c 2	street language
0	3	B	1 c 3	equal mix
0	3	B	1 c 4	other
	3	B	3	**maintenance**
	3	B	3 a	*type?*
0	3	B	3 a 1	language lab
1	3	B	3 a 2	DL
0	3	B	3 a 3	college classes
1	3	B	3 a 4	immersion
0	3	B	3 a 5	classroom (DLI, etc.)
0	3	B	3 a 6	language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)

0	3	B	3	a	7	other
	3	B	3	b		*how often?*
0	3	B	3	b	1	weekly
0	3	B	3	b	3	monthly
2	3	B	3	b	5	other
	3	B	3	b	6	annually
	3	B	3	d		*issues in maintenance*
0	3	B	3	d	2	should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
0	3	B	3	d	4	other
	3	C				**The most effective training options for initial acquisition and sustainment/enhancement training**
	3	C	1			*for initial acquisition*
5	3	C	1	a		classroom
7	3	C	1	b		classroom/immersion combo
2	3	C	1	c		other
	3	C	2			*for sustaining/enhancing*
1	3	C	2	a		immersion
4	3	C	2	d		other
	3	D				**Should training be voluntary or involuntary**
2	3	D	1			mandatory for all
0	3	D	3			voluntary
0	3	D	5			based on aptitude/interest
2	3	D	6			basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
1	3	D	8			other
	3	F				**Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities**
	3	F	1			*What are these barriers?*
0	3	F	1	a		financial costs of training

8	3	F	1	b	no time for dedicated long period of language training
0	3	F	1	c	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
0	3	F	1	d	no language lab
0	3	F	1	e	low priority for leadership
0	3	F	1	f	time not being used efficiently
1	3	F	1	g	other
0	3	F	1	h	other lack of resources
0	3	F	1	i	lack of awareness of resources
	3	F	1	k	no structured program / maintenance
	3	F	2		*How can they be removed?*
0	3	F	2	a	discretionary language funds for units
1	3	F	2	b	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
0	3	F	2	c	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
0	3	F	2	d	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
1	3	F	2	e	other
	3	G			**What would you recommend to motivate improved language proficiency?**
	3	G	1		*pay*
1	3	G	1	a	pay based on language difficulty
0	3	G	1	b	no cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated
0	3	G	1	c	pay separately for proficiency in speaking than in listening/reading comprehension
0	3	G	1	d	pay based on the number of years you have maintained proficiency
0	3	G	1	e	more pay using current compensation system
0	3	G	1	g	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
1	3	G	1	h	other
	3	G	2		*practical use*
3	3	G	2	a	make sure they will be used in the field
2	3	G	2	b	other

	3	G	3		*recognition*
1	3	G	3	a	any type
	3	G	4		*other*
0	3	G	4	a	try and select those with prior language exposure
1	3	G	4	b	other
0	3	G	4	c	hold people accountable
	3	H			**Ways to improve training**
0	3	H	1		instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
0	3	H	3		allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
0	3	H	4		SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
3	3	H	6		Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
1	3	H	7		Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
1	3	H	8		Keep class size small (under 10)
3	3	H	9		other comments
1	3	H	10		Make proficiency a requirement to be eligible to deploy
0	3	H	11		Actually practice training sessions (they will be done down-range) in the native language stateside
0	3	H	12		CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
0	3	H	13		Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
1	3	H	14		other comments
0	3	H	15		Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
0	3	H	16		Imersion training is best

Appendix N:

Frequency Results for CA Active Duty Block 1

Freq	Categories				
	1	A			*Q1: "Tell us about a situation were having language skills and capabilities contributed to mission success?"*
	1	A	1		*Tasks performed?*
8	1	A	1	a	Training others
	1	A	1	b	Missions
	1	A	1	c	other
	1	A	2		*Which language was required of the mission:*
10	1	A	2	a	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
1	1	A	2	b	National language
3	1	A	2	c	Specific local dialect
	1	A	2	d	other
	1	A	3		*Level of proficiency required on the mission*
1	1	A	3	a	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases - listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
2	1	A	3	b	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
	1	A	3	c	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful
	1	A	3	e	other
	1	A	5		*How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?*
2	1	A	5	a	Not at all
	1	A	5	b	A little
1	1	A	5	c	A moderate amount
3	1	A	5	d	A lot
	1	A	6		*Proficiencies needed?*
1	1	A	6	a	General language (around town)
1	1	A	6	b	Technical-job related or military terms
	1	A	6	c	other
	1	A	7		*Which is more important?*

3	1	A	7	a				Speaking
	1	A	7	b				Reading
	1	A	7	c				Writing
	1	A	7	d				Listening
	1	A	7	e				other
	1	A	8					*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
1	1	A	8	b				Helpful but not essential
6	1	A	8	c				Essential
1	1	A	8	d				other
	1	A	9					*Do the natives typically speak English*
1	1	A	9	a				Most of them
4	1	A	9	b				Some of them
1	1	A	9	c				Few of them
1	1	A	9	d				None of them
	1	A	11					***Did you use job aids (e.g., Kwikpoint) to help prepare? If yes, what's your evaluation of the job aid?***
	1	A	11	a				**translators/interpreters**
	1	A	11	a	1			*How often*
4	1	A	11	a	1	a		yes - local interpreters, frequently
1	1	A	11	a	1	b		yes - local interpreters, infrequently
	1	A	11	a	1	c		yes - military provided interpreters, frequently
	1	A	11	a	1	d		yes - military provided interpreters, infrequently
1	1	A	11	a	1	e		rarely used interpreters
	1	A	11	a	2			*How important is it to use interpreters*
3	1	A	11	a	2	a		Essential
1	1	A	11	a	2	b		Helpful
	1	A	11	a	2	c		Of little use
	1	A	11	a	3			*Issues in selecting interpreter*

4	1	A	11	a	3	a		Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
1	1	A	11	a	3	b		Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
	1	A	11	a	3	c		As long as they speak English their OK
2	1	A	11	a	3	d		Proper selection interpreters is important
	1	A	11	a	3	f		Can't trust interpreters
	1	A	11	a	3	g		other interpreter issues
	1	A	11	d				**Note cards with phrases**
	1	A	11	d	1			sometime
1	1	A	11	d	2			always
	1	A	11	d	3			other
	1	A	11	e				**jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal**
2	1	A	11	e	1			on occasion
1	1	A	11	F				**other**
	1	C						*General Themes:*
	1	C	1					*Additional Language Training Needs*
	1	C	1	a				Spoken
	1	C	1	b				Written
1	1	C	1	d				Street/slang
	1	C	1	e				Formal/presentation language
1	1	C	1	f				Flexibility - broad range of skills
1	1	C	1	g				Cultural language training
1	1	C	1	h				Cultural non-verbal language training
	1	C	1	i				Dialect Training
1	1	C	1	j				Immersion training
	1	C	1	k				More time in formal classes
3	1	C	1	n				Other
	1	C	2					*Benefits of proficiency:*

	1	C	2	a		*Basic*
	1	C	2	a	1	Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
	1	C	2	a	2	Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
	1	C	2	a	3	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	1	C	2	b		*More advanced*
	1	C	2	b	2	Identifying important documents in another language
	1	C	2	b	3	Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
1	1	C	2	b	4	Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
1	1	C	2	b	5	other
	1	C	2	c		*Unspecified*
4	1	C	2	c	1	Builds rapport/trust
1	1	C	2	c	2	Enhances communication effectiveness
	1	C	2	c	3	Increases efficiency/speed of mission
3	1	C	2	c	5	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
1	1	C	2	c	6	Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
	1	C	2	c	7	Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
1	1	C	2	c	8	Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
	1	C	2	D		other
	1	C	3			***Consequences of a lack of proficiency:***
1	1	C	3	a		Can be dangerous
	1	C	3	b		May causes mission abort/failure
	1	C	3	c		May slow mission
	1	C	3	d		May decrease mission effectiveness
	1	C	3	e		May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)
	1	C	3	f		Can lead to selection of inappropriate translator
5	1	D				***Other comments:***
17	4					***incomplete data - not able to code (across all blocks)***

Appendix O:

Frequency Results for CA Reserve Duty Block 1

Freq	Categories				
	1	A			*Q1: "Tell us about a situation were having language skills and capabilities contributed to mission success?"*
	1	A	1		*Tasks performed?*
1	1	A	1	a	Training others
8	1	A	1	b	Missions
1	1	A	1	c	other
	1	A	2		*Which language was required of the mission:*
3	1	A	2	a	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
7	1	A	2	b	National language
4	1	A	2	c	Specific local dialect
	1	A	2	d	other
	1	A	3		*Level of proficiency required on the mission*
3	1	A	3	a	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases - listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
5	1	A	3	b	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
2	1	A	3	c	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful
2	1	A	3	e	other
	1	A	5		*How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?*
	1	A	5	a	Not at all
	1	A	5	b	A little
1	1	A	5	c	A moderate amount
3	1	A	5	d	A lot
	1	A	6		*Proficiencies needed?*
12	1	A	6	a	General language (around town)
6	1	A	6	b	Technical-job related or military terms
	1	A	6	c	other
1	1	A	7		*Which is more important?*

7	1	A	7	a				Speaking
3	1	A	7	b				Reading
4	1	A	7	c				Writing
7	1	A	7	d				Listening
	1	A	7	e				other
	1	A	8					*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
2	1	A	8	b				Helpful but not essential
7	1	A	8	c				Essential
1	1	A	8	d				other
	1	A	9					*Do the natives typically speak English*
	1	A	9	a				Most of them
2	1	A	9	b				Some of them
2	1	A	9	c				Few of them
1	1	A	9	d				None of them
	1	A	11					***Did you use job aids (e.g., Kwikpoint) to help prepare? If yes, what's your evaluation of the job aid?***
	1	A	11	a				**translators/interpreters**
	1	A	11	a	1			*How often*
4	1	A	11	a	1	a		yes - local interpreters, frequently
1	1	A	11	a	1	b		yes - local interpreters, infrequently
3	1	A	11	a	1	c		yes - military provided interpreters, frequently
	1	A	11	a	1	d		yes - military provided interpreters, infrequently
	1	A	11	a	1	e		rarely used interpreters
1	1	A	11	a	2			*How important is it to use interpreters*
6	1	A	11	a	2	a		Essential
4	1	A	11	a	2	b		Helpful
	1	A	11	a	2	c		Of little use
2	1	A	11	a	3			*Issues in selecting interpreter*

3	1	A	11	a	3	a		Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
1	1	A	11	a	3	b		Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
1	1	A	11	a	3	c		As long as they speak English their OK
5	1	A	11	a	3	d		Proper selection interpreters is important
3	1	A	11	a	3	f		Can't trust interpreters
	1	A	11	a	3	g		other interpreter issues
	1	A	11	d				**Note cards with phrases**
1	1	A	11	d	1			sometime
	1	A	11	d	2			always
	1	A	11	d	3			other
	1	A	11	e				**jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal**
3	1	A	11	e	1			on occasion
2	1	A	11	F				**other**
	1	C						*General Themes:*
	1	C	1					*Additional Language Training Needs*
4	1	C	1	a				Spoken
	1	C	1	b				Written
4	1	C	1	d				Street/slang
	1	C	1	e				Formal/presentation language
4	1	C	1	f				Flexibility - broad range of skills
8	1	C	1	g				Cultural language training
3	1	C	1	h				Cultural non-verbal language training
1	1	C	1	i				Dialect Training
1	1	C	1	j				Immersion training
5	1	C	1	k				More time in formal classes
5	1	C	1	n				Other
	1	C	2					*Benefits of proficiency:*

	1	C	2	a			*Basic*
7	1	C	2	a	1		Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
2	1	C	2	a	2		Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
4	1	C	2	a	3		Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	1	C	2	b			*More advanced*
	1	C	2	b	2		Identifying important documents in another language
3	1	C	2	b	3		Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
3	1	C	2	b	4		Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
	1	C	2	b	5		other
	1	C	2	c			*Unspecified*
9	1	C	2	c	1		Builds rapport/trust
6	1	C	2	c	2		Enhances communication effectiveness
1	1	C	2	c	3		Increases efficiency/speed of mission
3	1	C	2	c	5		Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
5	1	C	2	c	6		Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
1	1	C	2	c	7		Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
	1	C	2	c	8		Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
	1	C	2	D			other
	1	C	3				***Consequences of a lack of proficiency:***
2	1	C	3	a			Can be dangerous
2	1	C	3	b			May causes mission abort/failure
5	1	C	3	c			May slow mission
3	1	C	3	d			May decrease mission effectiveness
1	1	C	3	e			May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)
	1	C	3	f			Can lead to selection of inappropriate translator
3	1	D				***Other comments:***	
1	4						***incomplete data - not able to code (all blocks)***

Appendix P:

Frequency Results for CA Active Duty Block 2

Freq	Categories				
	2	A			**General issues in training effectiveness**
	2	A	1		*with immersion*
	2	A	1	a	timing (too long before deployment)
1	2	A	1	b	immersed with others or by self
2	2	A	1	d	cultural aspect of immersion is important
	2	A	1	f	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
2	2	A	1	g	other
	2	A	2		*that contribute to a lack of preparation*
	2	A	2	a	missions in many locations
	2	A	2	b	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
	2	A	2	c	other
	2	A	3		*tools to use in training/preparation*
	2	A	3	a	reading - to build vocabulary
	2	A	3	b	language labs are very valuable
	2	A	3	c	other
	2	A	5		*Why do people learn languages*
1	2	A	5	a	Current pay is not a strong motivator
	2	A	5	b	Pride / wanting to do a better job
	2	A	5	c	To make missions easier on themselves
4	2	A	5	d	Pay
1	2	A	5	e	other
	2	A	6		*other*
	2	B			***"Classroom training and live emersion training (LET) programs are not always available. Is distributive learning (DL) or technology-delivered training (TDT) a viable option for training language?" Give example if necessary.***
	2	B	1		*possible alternatives to traditional training*

	2	B	1	a	pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
	2	B	1	b	tutoring in specific languages
	2	B	1	d	immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site
	2	B	1	e	other
	2	B	2		*Issues*
	2	B	2	a	emersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks.
	2	B	2	b	DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them
	2	B	2	c	other
	2	B	3		*would DL, TDT solutions be effective*
	2	B	3	a	maybe a little
	2	B	3	c	yes, anything helps
	2	B	3	d	other
	2	B	4		*other comments about DL,TDT*
	2	B	4	a	Rosetta stone program is really helpful
	2	B	4	c	other
	2	B	5		*DL, TDT not very effective*
	2	B	6		*DL, etc. should be more widely available*

	2	C			**Issues in proficiency assessment**
	2	C	1		*DPLT*
	2	C	1	a	Needs to be less military specific
1	2	C	1	b	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
	2	C	1	c	is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
4	2	C	1	d	needs improvement
	2	C	1	e	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
1	2	C	1	f	other
2	2	C	1	g	is not a valid measure of usage in the field

	2	C	2		*On the need for speaking to be assessed*
6	2	C	2	a	Needs to incorporate speaking into DPLT some way / Use OPI
1	2	C	2	d	other comments
	2	C	3		*OPI*
2	2	C	3	a	Is a good test
	2	C	3	b	Is too subjective
	2	C	3	c	other comments
	2	C	5		Other

	2	**D**			**Issues with specific programs**
	2	D	1		*DLI Arabic program*
	2	D	1	b	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
	2	D	1	c	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
	2	D	1	e	other comments
	2	D	3		*DLI courses in general*
	2	D	3	a	Need a greater speaking focus
	2	D	3	b	Spend too much time teaching specifically for DPLT
	2	D	3	c	other comments
	2	D	4		*Berlitz*
	2	D	4	a	Korean program had a good emphasis on conversational language which was helpful
1	2	D	4	b	other comments
	2	D	5		*SWC*
	2	D	5	a	Not enough focus on military language
	2	D	5	b	Not long enough
	2	D	5	c	other comments
	2	D	6		*other programs*
1	2	D	6	a	other comments

2

2	E			**Special Issues with reservists:**
2	E	1		*training timing*
2	E	1	a	should take place right after all other & basic training
2	E	1	b	other comments
2	E	2		*time concerns*
2	E	2	a	during drill weekends, there is no time for language drills
2	E	2	b	going to DLI for a year is not feasible for many/most reservists
2	E	2	c	other comments
2	E	3		*Language requirements*
2	E	3	a	should be required
2	E	3	b	there is no pre-deployment training - it should be required as well.
2	E	3	c	other comments
2	E	4		*pay issues*
2	E	4	a	given lack of time during drills, consider paying people to study on their own time
2	E	4	b	FLPP is really low for reservists
2	E	4	c	FLPP is not a motivator for reservists
2	E	4	d	better FLPP would motivate reservists to study on their own
2	E	4	e	other pay comments
2	E	4	f	should be paid at lower proficiency levels than enlisted persons
2	E	5		*immersion training*
2	E	5	a	there is very little opportunity for emersion in reserves, needs to be more
2	E	5	b	many reservists don't believe immersion is possible for them
2	E	5	c	other
2	E	6		*training options*
2	E	6	a	need a wide range
2	E	6	c	local training programs might be an option

2 E 6 d   very few slots for DLI and other programs are available

2 E 6 e   other

2 E 7   *support from command (or higher levels)*

2 E 7 a   not much

2 E 7 b   some

2 E 7 d   not at all

2 E 8   *technology*

2 E 8 d   other technology-related comments

Appendix Q:

Frequency Results for CA Reserve Duty Block 2

Freq	Categories				
	2	A			**General issues in training effectiveness**
	2	A	1		*with immersion*
	2	A	1	a	timing (too long before deployment)
	2	A	1	b	immersed with others or by self
	2	A	1	d	cultural aspect of immersion is important
	2	A	1	f	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
2	2	A	1	g	other
	2	A	2		*that contribute to a lack of preparation*
5	2	A	2	a	missions in many locations
3	2	A	2	b	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
	2	A	2	c	other
	2	A	3		*tools to use in training/preparation*
1	2	A	3	a	reading - to build vocabulary
	2	A	3	b	language labs are very valuable
2	2	A	3	c	other
	2	A	5		*Why do people learn languages*
1	2	A	5	a	Current pay is not a strong motivator
2	2	A	5	b	Pride / wanting to do a better job
2	2	A	5	c	To make missions easier on themselves
	2	A	5	d	Pay
1	2	A	5	e	other
1	2	A	6		*other*
	2	B			*"Classroom training and live emersion training (LET) programs are not always available. Is distributive learning (DL) or technology-delivered training (TDT) a viable option for training language?" Give example if necessary.*
	2	B	1		*possible alternatives to traditional training*

1	2	B	1	a	pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
2	2	B	1	b	tutoring in specific languages
1	2	B	1	d	immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site
4	2	B	1	e	other
	2	B	2		*Issues*
	2	B	2	a	immersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks.
1	2	B	2	b	DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them
	2	B	2	c	other
	2	B	3		*would DL, TDT solutions be effective*
	2	B	3	a	maybe a little
4	2	B	3	c	yes, anything helps
	2	B	3	d	other
	2	B	4		*other comments about DL, TDT*
	2	B	4	a	Rosetta stone program is really helpful
	2	B	4	c	other
	2	B	5		*DL, TDT not very effective*
3	2	B	6		*DL, etc. should be more widely available*
	2	**C**			**Issues in proficiency assessment**
1	2	C	1		*DPLT*
1	2	C	1	a	Needs to be less military specific
	2	C	1	b	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
	2	C	1	c	is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
3	2	C	1	d	needs improvement
1	2	C	1	e	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
1	2	C	1	f	other
1	2	C	1	g	is not a valid measure of usage in the field

	2	C	2		*On the need for speaking to be assessed*
3	2	C	2	a	Needs to incorporate speaking into DPLT some way / Use OPI
	2	C	2	d	other comments
	2	C	3		*OPI*
	2	C	3	a	Is a good test
	2	C	3	b	Is too subjective
	2	C	3	c	other comments
	2	C	5		Other

	2	**D**			**Issues with specific programs**
	2	D	1		*DLI Arabic program*
2	2	D	1	b	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
3	2	D	1	c	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
1	2	D	1	e	other comments
	2	D	3		*DLI courses in general*
	2	D	3	a	Need a greater speaking focus
	2	D	3	b	Spend too much time teaching specifically for DPLT
5	2	D	3	c	other comments
	2	D	4		*Berlitz*
	2	D	4	a	Korean program had a good emphasis on conversational language which was helpful
	2	D	4	b	other comments
	2	D	5		*SWC*
	2	D	5	a	Not enough focus on military language
	2	D	5	b	Not long enough
	2	D	5	c	other comments
	2	D	6		*other programs*
4	2	D	6	a	other comments

	2				
	2	E			**Special Issues with reservists:**
	2	E	1		*training timing*
1	2	E	1	a	should take place right after all other & basic training
3	2	E	1	b	other comments
	2	E	2		*time concerns*
4	2	E	2	a	during drill weekends, there is no time for language drills
	2	E	2	b	going to DLI for a year is not feasible for many/most reservists
3	2	E	2	c	other comments
	2	E	3		*Language requirements*
	2	E	3	a	should be required
	2	E	3	b	there is no pre-deployment training - it should be required as well.
3	2	E	3	c	other comments
	2	E	4		*pay issues*
2	2	E	4	a	given lack of time during drills, consider paying people to study on their own time
3	2	E	4	b	FLPP is really low for reservists
4	2	E	4	c	FLPP is not a motivator for reservists
2	2	E	4	d	better FLPP would motivate reservists to study on their own
10	2	E	4	e	other pay comments
	2	E	4	f	should be paid at lower proficiency levels than enlisted persons
	2	E	5		*immersion training*
1	2	E	5	a	there is very little opportunity for emersion in reserves, needs to be more
1	2	E	5	b	many reservists don't believe immersion is possible for them
6	2	E	5	c	other
	2	E	6		*training options*
3	2	E	6	a	need a wide range
1	2	E	6	c	local training programs might be an option

	2	E	6	d	very few slots for DLI and other programs are available
7	2	E	6	e	other
	2	E	7		*support from command (or higher levels)*
1	2	E	7	a	not much
	2	E	7	b	some
	2	E	7	d	not at all
	2	E	8		*technology*
6	2	E	8	d	other technology-related comments

Appendix R:

Frequency Results for CA Active Duty Block 3

Freq	Categories					
	3	A				**Mission language requirement**
	3	A	1			**which language skills are relevant**
	3	A	1	a		*#1 priority*
3	3	A	1	a	1	speaking
2	3	A	1	a	2	listening
	3	A	1	a	3	writing
	3	A	1	a	4	reading
	3	A	1	a	6	other
	3	A	1	b		*#2 priority*
1	3	A	1	b	1	speaking
1	3	A	1	b	2	listening
	3	A	1	b	3	writing
	3	A	1	b	4	reading
	3	A	1	b	6	other
	3	A	1	c		*#3 priority*
	3	A	1	c	1	speaking
	3	A	1	c	2	listening
	3	A	1	c	3	writing
1	3	A	1	c	4	reading
	3	A	1	c	6	other
	3	A	1	d		*#4 priority*
	3	A	1	d	1	speaking
	3	A	1	d	2	listening
1	3	A	1	d	3	writing
	3	A	1	d	4	reading

	3	A	1	d	6	other
	3	A				**what proficiency levels are needed**
	3	A	2			1-1
1	3	A	3			2-2
	3	A	4			3-3
	3	A	5			can have a variety within a given unit
	3	A	6			other
	3	B				**Where training fits into the career lifecycle**
	3	B	1			**school training**
	3	B	1	a		*when in pipeline?*
	3	B	1	a	1	early - as part of some of the first training that occurs
	3	B	1	a	2	late but before being sent to unit - just before send off to unit
3	3	B	1	a	3	very late - after sent to unit (to prevent burnout)
	3	B	1	a	4	other
	3	B	1	c		*primary emphasis should be?*
	3	B	1	c	1	military language
	3	B	1	c	2	street language
	3	B	1	c	3	equal mix
	3	B	1	c	4	other
	3	B	3			**maintenance**
	3	B	3	a		*type?*
2	3	B	3	a	1	language lab
	3	B	3	a	2	DL
	3	B	3	a	3	college classes
3	3	B	3	a	4	immersion
	3	B	3	a	5	classroom (DLI, etc.)
1	3	B	3	a	6	language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)

	3	B	3	a	7	other
	3	B	3	b		*how often?*
1	3	B	3	b	1	weekly
	3	B	3	b	3	monthly
3	3	B	3	b	5	other
2	3	B	3	b	6	annually
	3	B	3	d		*issues in maintenance*
	3	B	3	d	2	should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
	3	B	3	d	4	other
	3	**C**				**The most effective training options for initial acquisition and sustainment/enhancement training**
	3	C	1			*for initial acquisition*
	3	C	1	a		classroom
1	3	C	1	b		classroom/immersion combo
	3	C	1	c		other
	3	C	2			*for sustaining/enhancing*
3	3	C	2	a		immersion
2	3	C	2	d		other
	3	**D**				**Should training be voluntary or involuntary**
2	3	D	1			mandatory for all
	3	D	3			voluntary
	3	D	5			based on aptitude/interest
	3	D	6			basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
1	3	D	8			other
	3	**F**				**Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities**
	3	F	1			*What are these barriers?*
4	3	F	1	a		financial costs of training

5	3	F	1	b	no time for dedicated long period of language training
	3	F	1	c	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
5	3	F	1	d	no language lab
2	3	F	1	e	low priority for leadership
	3	F	1	f	time not being used efficiently
1	3	F	1	g	other
3	3	F	1	h	other lack of resources
	3	F	1	i	lack of awareness of resources
	3	F	1	k	no structured program / maintenance
	3	F	2		*How can they be removed?*
1	3	F	2	a	discretionary language funds for units
	3	F	2	b	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
	3	F	2	c	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
1	3	F	2	d	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
2	3	F	2	e	other
	3	**G**			**What would you recommend to motivate improved language proficiency?**
	3	G	1		*pay*
1	3	G	1	a	pay based on language difficulty
2	3	G	1	b	no cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated
	3	G	1	c	pay separately for proficiency in speaking than in listening/reading comprehension
1	3	G	1	d	pay based on the number of years you have maintained proficiency
	3	G	1	e	more pay using current compensation system
	3	G	1	g	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
2	3	G	1	h	other
	3	G	2		*practical use*
	3	G	2	a	make sure they will be used in the field
	3	G	2	b	other

	3	G	3		*recognition*
	3	G	3	a	any type
	3	G	4		*other*
	3	G	4	a	try and select those with prior language exposure
5	3	G	4	b	other
2	3	G	4	c	hold people accountable
	3	H			**Ways to improve training**
	3	H	1		instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
1	3	H	3		allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
	3	H	4		SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
	3	H	6		Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
	3	H	7		Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
	3	H	8		Keep class size small (under 10)
2	3	H	9		other comments
	3	H	10		Make proficiency a requirement to be eligible to deploy
	3	H	11		Actually practice training sessions (they will be done down-range) in the native language stateside
4	3	H	12		CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
1	3	H	13		Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
3	3	H	14		other comments
	3	H	15		Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
1	3	H	16		Imersion training is best

Appendix S:

Frequency Results for CA Reserve Duty Block 3

Freq	Categories					
	3	A				**Mission language requirement**
	3	A	1			**which language skills are relevant**
	3	A	1	a		*#1 priority*
1	3	A	1	a	1	speaking
3	3	A	1	a	2	listening
	3	A	1	a	3	writing
	3	A	1	a	4	reading
	3	A	1	a	6	other
	3	A	1	b		*#2 priority*
1	3	A	1	b	1	speaking
	3	A	1	b	2	listening
	3	A	1	b	3	writing
2	3	A	1	b	4	reading
	3	A	1	b	6	other
	3	A	1	c		*#3 priority*
	3	A	1	c	1	speaking
	3	A	1	c	2	listening
1	3	A	1	c	3	writing
1	3	A	1	c	4	reading
	3	A	1	c	6	other
	3	A	1	d		*#4 priority*
	3	A	1	d	1	speaking
	3	A	1	d	2	listening
1	3	A	1	d	3	writing
	3	A	1	d	4	reading

	3	A	1	d	6	other
	3	A				**what proficiency levels are needed**
2	3	A	2			1-1
1	3	A	3			2-2
	3	A	4			3-3
	3	A	5			can have a variety within a given unit
1	3	A	6			other
	3	B				**Where training fits into the career lifecycle**
	3	B	1			**school training**
4	3	B	1	a		*when in pipeline?*
5	3	B	1	a	1	early - as part of some of the first training that occurs
	3	B	1	a	2	late but before being sent to unit - just before send off to unit
	3	B	1	a	3	very late - after sent to unit (to prevent burnout)
2	3	B	1	a	4	other
1	3	B	1	c		*primary emphasis should be?*
1	3	B	1	c	1	military language
	3	B	1	c	2	street language
	3	B	1	c	3	equal mix
2	3	B	1	c	4	other
	3	B	3			**maintenance**
	3	B	3	a		*type?*
1	3	B	3	a	1	language lab
	3	B	3	a	2	DL
	3	B	3	a	3	college classes
2	3	B	3	a	4	immersion
8	3	B	3	a	5	classroom (DLI, etc.)
1	3	B	3	a	6	language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)

2	3	B	3	a	7	other
	3	B	3	b		*how often?*
	3	B	3	b	1	weekly
1	3	B	3	b	3	monthly
3	3	B	3	b	5	other
2	3	B	3	b	6	annually
	3	B	3	d		*issues in maintenance*
2	3	B	3	d	2	should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
2	3	B	3	d	4	other

	3	C			**The most effective training options for initial acquisition and sustainment/enhancement training**
	3	C	1		*for initial acquisition*
	3	C	1	a	classroom
2	3	C	1	b	classroom/immersion combo
5	3	C	1	c	other
	3	C	2		*for sustaining/enhancing*
1	3	C	2	a	immersion
3	3	C	2	d	other
	3	D			**Should training be voluntary or involuntary**
3	3	D	1		mandatory for all
2	3	D	3		voluntary
3	3	D	5		based on aptitude/interest
4	3	D	6		basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
	3	D	8		other
	3	F			**Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities**
	3	F	1		*What are these barriers?*
1	3	F	1	a	financial costs of training

10	3	F	1	b	no time for dedicated long period of language training
	3	F	1	c	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
1	3	F	1	d	no language lab
2	3	F	1	e	low priority for leadership
4	3	F	1	f	time not being used efficiently
4	3	F	1	g	other
	3	F	1	h	other lack of resources
	3	F	1	i	lack of awareness of resources
	3	F	1	k	no structured program / maintenance
	3	F	2		*How can they be removed?*
1	3	F	2	a	discretionary language funds for units
2	3	F	2	b	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
1	3	F	2	c	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
1	3	F	2	d	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
2	3	F	2	e	other
	3	G			**What would you recommend to motivate improved language proficiency?**
	3	G	1		*pay*
	3	G	1	a	pay based on language difficulty
	3	G	1	b	no cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated
	3	G	1	c	pay separately for proficiency in speaking than in listening/reading comprehension
	3	G	1	d	pay based on the number of years you have maintained proficiency
	3	G	1	e	more pay using current compensation system
1	3	G	1	g	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
1	3	G	1	h	other
	3	G	2		*practical use*
3	3	G	2	a	make sure they will be used in the field
	3	G	2	b	other

	3	G	3		*recognition*
3	3	G	3	a	any type
	3	G	4		*other*
	3	G	4	a	try and select those with prior language exposure
5	3	G	4	b	other
	3	G	4	c	hold people accountable
	3	H			**Ways to improve training**
	3	H	1		instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
1	3	H	3		allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
1	3	H	4		SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
3	3	H	6		Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
1	3	H	7		Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
1	3	H	8		Keep class size small (under 10)
	3	H	9		other comments
	3	H	10		Make proficiency a requirement to be eligible to deploy
	3	H	11		Actually practice training sessions (they will be done down-range) in the native language stateside
1	3	H	12		CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
	3	H	13		Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
6	3	H	14		other comments
4	3	H	15		Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
	3	H	16		Imersion training is best

Appendix T:

Frequency Results for PO Active Duty Block 1

Freq	Categories				
	1	A			**Q1: "Tell us about a situation were having language skills and capabilities contributed to mission success?"**
	1	A	1		*Tasks performed?*
2	1	A	1	a	Training others
6	1	A	1	b	Missions
1	1	A	1	c	other
	1	A	2		*Which language was required of the mission:*
3	1	A	2	a	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
2	1	A	2	b	National language
3	1	A	2	c	Specific local dialect
1	1	A	2	d	other
	1	A	3		*Level of proficiency required on the mission*
1	1	A	3	a	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases - listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
4	1	A	3	b	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
3	1	A	3	c	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful
1	1	A	3	e	other
	1	A	5		*How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?*
1	1	A	5	a	Not at all
1	1	A	5	b	A little
3	1	A	5	c	A moderate amount
3	1	A	5	d	A lot
	1	A	6		*Proficiencies needed?*
3	1	A	6	a	General language (around town)
1	1	A	6	b	Technical-job related or military terms
1	1	A	6	c	other
	1	A	7		*Which is more important?*

2	1	A	7	a				Speaking
1	1	A	7	b				Reading
2	1	A	7	c				Writing
1	1	A	7	d				Listening
	1	A	7	e				other
	1	A	8					*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
1	1	A	8	b				Helpful but not essential
1	1	A	8	c				Essential
1	1	A	8	d				other
	1	A	9					*Do the natives typically speak English*
	1	A	9	a				Most of them
1	1	A	9	b				Some of them
	1	A	9	c				Few of them
2	1	A	9	d				None of them
	1	A	11					***Did you use job aids (e.g., Kwikpoint) to help prepare? If yes, what's your evaluation of the job aid?***
2	1	A	11	a				**translators/interpreters**
	1	A	11	a	1			*How often*
1	1	A	11	a	1	a		yes - local interpreters, frequently
4	1	A	11	a	1	b		yes - local interpreters, infrequently
1	1	A	11	a	1	c		yes - military provided interpreters, frequently
	1	A	11	a	1	d		yes - military provided interpreters, infrequently
1	1	A	11	a	1	e		rarely used interpreters
	1	A	11	a	2			*How important is it to use interpreters*
2	1	A	11	a	2	a		Essential
2	1	A	11	a	2	b		Helpful
1	1	A	11	a	2	c		Of little use
1	1	A	11	a	3			*Issues in selecting interpreter*

3	1	A	11	a	3	a		Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
	1	A	11	a	3	b		Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
2	1	A	11	a	3	c		As long as they speak English their OK
4	1	A	11	a	3	d		Proper selection interpreters is important
	1	A	11	a	3	f		Can't trust interpreters
	1	A	11	a	3	g		other interpreter issues
	1	A	11	d				**Note cards with phrases**
	1	A	11	d	1			sometime
	1	A	11	d	2			always
	1	A	11	d	3			other
	1	A	11	e				**jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal**
	1	A	11	e	1			on occasion
1	1	A	11	F				**other**
	1	C						*General Themes:*
	1	C	1					*Additional Language Training Needs*
1	1	C	1	a				Spoken
	1	C	1	b				Written
1	1	C	1	d				Street/slang
	1	C	1	e				Formal/presentation language
	1	C	1	f				Flexibility - broad range of skills
3	1	C	1	g				Cultural language training
	1	C	1	h				Cultural non-verbal language training
1	1	C	1	i				Dialect Training
2	1	C	1	j				Immersion training
1	1	C	1	k				More time in formal classes
1	1	C	1	n				Other
	1	C	2					*Benefits of proficiency:*

	1	C	2	a			*Basic*
1	1	C	2	a	1		Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
	1	C	2	a	2		Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
1	1	C	2	a	3		Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	1	C	2	b			*More advanced*
2	1	C	2	b	2		Identifying important documents in another language
1	1	C	2	b	3		Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
1	1	C	2	b	4		Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
	1	C	2	b	5		other
	1	C	2	c			*Unspecified*
2	1	C	2	c	1		Builds rapport/trust
	1	C	2	c	2		Enhances communication effectiveness
2	1	C	2	c	3		Increases efficiency/speed of mission
	1	C	2	c	5		Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	1	C	2	c	6		Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
	1	C	2	c	7		Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
1	1	C	2	c	8		Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
	1	C	2	D			other
	1	C	3				***Consequences of a lack of proficiency:***
1	1	C	3	a			Can be dangerous
	1	C	3	b			May causes mission abort/failure
5	1	C	3	c			May slow mission
3	1	C	3	d			May decrease mission effectiveness
	1	C	3	e			May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)
	1	C	3	f			Can lead to selection of inappropriate translator
1	1	D					***Other comments:***
	4						***incomplete data - not able to code in any block***

Appendix U:

Frequency Results for PO Reserve Duty Block 1

Freq	Categories				
	1	A			**Q1: "Tell us about a situation were having language skills and capabilities contributed to mission success?"**
	1	A	1		*Tasks performed?*
1	1	A	1	a	Training others
2	1	A	1	b	Missions
	1	A	1	c	other
	1	A	2		*Which language was required of the mission:*
3	1	A	2	a	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
5	1	A	2	b	National language
3	1	A	2	c	Specific local dialect
	1	A	2	d	other
	1	A	3		*Level of proficiency required on the mission*
1	1	A	3	a	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases - listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
1	1	A	3	b	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
1	1	A	3	c	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful
1	1	A	3	e	other
	1	A	5		*How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?*
	1	A	5	a	Not at all
	1	A	5	b	A little
1	1	A	5	c	A moderate amount
3	1	A	5	d	A lot
	1	A	6		*Proficiencies needed?*
4	1	A	6	a	General language (around town)
	1	A	6	b	Technical-job related or military terms
	1	A	6	c	other
	1	A	7		*Which is more important?*

7	1	A	7	a			Speaking
	1	A	7	b			Reading
1	1	A	7	c			Writing
2	1	A	7	d			Listening
	1	A	7	e			other
	1	A	8				*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
	1	A	8	b			Helpful but not essential
	1	A	8	c			Essential
1	1	A	8	d			other
	1	A	9				*Do the natives typically speak English*
1	1	A	9	a			Most of them
2	1	A	9	b			Some of them
	1	A	9	c			Few of them
	1	A	9	d			None of them
	1	A	11				***Did you use job aids (e.g., Kwikpoint) to help prepare? If yes, what's your evaluation of the job aid?***
1	1	A	11	a			**translators/interpreters**
	1	A	11	a	1		*How often*
2	1	A	11	a	1	a	yes - local interpreters, frequently
3	1	A	11	a	1	b	yes - local interpreters, infrequently
3	1	A	11	a	1	c	yes - military provided interpreters, frequently
	1	A	11	a	1	d	yes - military provided interpreters, infrequently
	1	A	11	a	1	e	rarely used interpreters
1	1	A	11	a	2		*How important is it to use interpreters*
1	1	A	11	a	2	a	Essential
2	1	A	11	a	2	b	Helpful
	1	A	11	a	2	c	Of little use
1	1	A	11	a	3		*Issues in selecting interpreter*

6	1	A	11	a	3	a		Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
2	1	A	11	a	3	b		Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
3	1	A	11	a	3	c		As long as they speak English their OK
4	1	A	11	a	3	d		Proper selection interpreters is important
	1	A	11	a	3	f		Can't trust interpreters
1	1	A	11	a	3	g		other interpreter issues
	1	A	11	d				**Note cards with phrases**
4	1	A	11	d	1			sometime
	1	A	11	d	2			always
1	1	A	11	d	3			other
	1	A	11	e				**jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal**
1	1	A	11	e	1			on occasion
3	1	A	11	F				**other**
	1	C					*General Themes:*	
	1	C	1				*Additional Language Training Needs*	
3	1	C	1	a			Spoken	
1	1	C	1	b			Written	
7	1	C	1	d			Street/slang	
	1	C	1	e			Formal/presentation language	
	1	C	1	f			Flexibility - broad range of skills	
9	1	C	1	g			Cultural language training	
1	1	C	1	h			Cultural non-verbal language training	
4	1	C	1	i			Dialect Training	
	1	C	1	j			Immersion training	
3	1	C	1	k			More time in formal classes	
1	1	C	1	n			Other	
	1	C	2				*Benefits of proficiency:*	

	1	C	2	a		*Basic*
2	1	C	2	a	1	Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
2	1	C	2	a	2	Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
1	1	C	2	a	3	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	1	C	2	b		*More advanced*
	1	C	2	b	2	Identifying important documents in another language
	1	C	2	b	3	Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
1	1	C	2	b	4	Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
	1	C	2	b	5	other
	1	C	2	c		*Unspecified*
7	1	C	2	c	1	Builds rapport/trust
9	1	C	2	c	2	Enhances communication effectiveness
1	1	C	2	c	3	Increases efficiency/speed of mission
4	1	C	2	c	5	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
1	1	C	2	c	6	Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
1	1	C	2	c	7	Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
1	1	C	2	c	8	Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
1	1	C	2	D		other
	1	C	3			***Consequences of a lack of proficiency:***
7	1	C	3	a		Can be dangerous
2	1	C	3	b		May causes mission abort/failure
	1	C	3	c		May slow mission
2	1	C	3	d		May decrease mission effectiveness
2	1	C	3	e		May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)
4	1	C	3	f		Can lead to selection of inappropriate translator
20	1	D				***Other comments:***
5	4					***incomplete data - not able to code (all blocks)***

Appendix V:

Frequency Results for PO Active Duty Block 2

Freq	Categories				
	2	A			**General issues in training effectiveness**
	2	A	1		*with immersion*
	2	A	1	a	timing (too long before deployment)
	2	A	1	b	immersed with others or by self
1	2	A	1	d	cultural aspect of immersion is important
3	2	A	1	f	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
4	2	A	1	g	other
	2	A	2		*that contribute to a lack of preparation*
	2	A	2	a	missions in many locations
	2	A	2	b	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
1	2	A	2	c	other
	2	A	3		*tools to use in training/preparation*
	2	A	3	a	reading - to build vocabulary
1	2	A	3	b	language labs are very valuable
1	2	A	3	c	other
	2	A	5		*Why do people learn languages*
2	2	A	5	a	Current pay is not a strong motivator
	2	A	5	b	Pride / wanting to do a better job
	2	A	5	c	To make missions easier on themselves
4	2	A	5	d	Pay
1	2	A	5	e	other
	2	A	6		*other*
	2	B			*"Classroom training and live emersion training (LET) programs are not always available. Is distributive learning (DL) or technology-delivered training (TDT) a viable option for training language?" Give example if necessary.*
	2	B	1		*possible alternatives to traditional training*

	2	B	1	a	pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
	2	B	1	b	tutoring in specific languages
2	2	B	1	d	immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site
7	2	B	1	e	other
	2	B	2		*Issues*
	2	B	2	a	immersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks.
	2	B	2	b	DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them
	2	B	2	c	other
	2	B	3		*would DL, \TDT solutions be effective*
	2	B	3	a	maybe a little
	2	B	3	c	yes, anything helps
	2	B	3	d	other
	2	B	4		*other comments about DL,TDT*
	2	B	4	a	Rosetta stone program is really helpful
	2	B	4	c	other
	2	B	5		*DL, TDT not very effective*
	2	B	6		*DL, etc. should be more widely available*

	2	**C**			**Issues in proficiency assessment**
	2	C	1		*DPLT*
1	2	C	1	a	Needs to be less military specific
	2	C	1	b	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
	2	C	1	c	is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
2	2	C	1	d	needs improvement
1	2	C	1	e	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
	2	C	1	f	other
	2	C	1	g	is not a valid measure of usage in the field

	2	C	2		*On the need for speaking to be assessed*
4	2	C	2	a	Needs to incorporate speaking into DPLT some way / Use OPI
	2	C	2	d	other comments
	2	C	3		*OPI*
1	2	C	3	a	Is a good test
	2	C	3	b	Is too subjective
1	2	C	3	c	other comments
	2	C	5		Other

	2	**D**			**Issues with specific programs**
	2	D	1		*DLI Arabic program*
	2	D	1	b	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
	2	D	1	c	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
	2	D	1	e	other comments
	2	D	3		*DLI courses in general*
3	2	D	3	a	Need a greater speaking focus
2	2	D	3	b	Spend too much time teaching specifically for DPLT
4	2	D	3	c	other comments
	2	D	4		*Berlitz*
	2	D	4	a	Korean program had a good emphasis on conversational language which was helpful
	2	D	4	b	other comments
	2	D	5		*SWC*
2	2	D	5	a	Not enough focus on military language
3	2	D	5	b	Not long enough
2	2	D	5	c	other comments
	2	D	6		*other programs*
2	2	D	6	a	other comments

2

2	E			**Special Issues with reservists:**
2	E	1		*training timing*
2	E	1	a	should take place right after all other & basic training
2	E	1	b	other comments
2	E	2		*time concerns*
2	E	2	a	during drill weekends, there is no time for language drills
2	E	2	b	going to DLI for a year is not feasible for many/most reservists
2	E	2	c	other comments
2	E	3		*Language requirements*
2	E	3	a	should be required
2	E	3	b	there is no pre-deployment training - it should be required as well.
2	E	3	c	other comments
2	E	4		*pay issues*
2	E	4	a	given lack of time during drills, consider paying people to study on their own time
2	E	4	b	FLPP is really low for reservists
2	E	4	c	FLPP is not a motivator for reservists
2	E	4	d	better FLPP would motivate reservists to study on their own
2	E	4	e	other pay comments
2	E	4	f	should be paid at lower proficiency levels than enlisted persons
2	E	5		*immersion training*
2	E	5	a	there is very little opportunity for emersion in reserves, needs to be more
2	E	5	b	many reservists don't believe immersion is possible for them
2	E	5	c	other
2	E	6		*training options*
2	E	6	a	need a wide range
2	E	6	c	local training programs might be an option

2 E 6 d   very few slots for DLI and other programs are available

2 E 6 e   other

2 E 7   *support from command (or higher levels)*

2 E 7 a   not much

2 E 7 b   some

2 E 7 d   not at all

2 E 8   *technology*

2 E 8 d   other technology-related comments

Appendix W:

Frequency Results for PO Reserve Duty Block 2

Freq	Categories				
	2	A			**General issues in training effectiveness**
	2	A	1		*with immersion*
	2	A	1	a	timing (too long before deployment)
	2	A	1	b	immersed with others or by self
1	2	A	1	d	cultural aspect of immersion is important
	2	A	1	f	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
1	2	A	1	g	other
	2	A	2		*that contribute to a lack of preparation*
1	2	A	2	a	missions in many locations
	2	A	2	b	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
1	2	A	2	c	other
	2	A	3		*tools to use in training/preparation*
	2	A	3	a	reading - to build vocabulary
1	2	A	3	b	language labs are very valuable
1	2	A	3	c	other
	2	A	5		*Why do people learn languages*
	2	A	5	a	Current pay is not a strong motivator
3	2	A	5	b	Pride / wanting to do a better job
2	2	A	5	c	To make missions easier on themselves
	2	A	5	d	Pay
1	2	A	5	e	other
	2	A	6		*other*
	2	B			*"Classroom training and live emersion training (LET) programs are not always available. Is distributive learning (DL) or technology-delivered training (TDT) a viable option for training language?" Give example if necessary.*
	2	B	1		*possible alternatives to traditional training*

	2	B	1	a	pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
	2	B	1	b	tutoring in specific languages
	2	B	1	d	immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site
	2	B	1	e	other
	2	B	2		*Issues*
1	2	B	2	a	immersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks.
	2	B	2	b	DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them
	2	B	2	c	other
	2	B	3		*would DL, TDT solutions be effective*
	2	B	3	a	maybe a little
3	2	B	3	c	yes, anything helps
2	2	B	3	d	other
	2	B	4		*other comments about DL, TDT*
1	2	B	4	a	Rosetta stone program is really helpful
1	2	B	4	c	other
4	2	B	5		*DL, TDT not very effective*
1	2	B	6		*DL, etc. should be more widely available*

	2	C			**Issues in proficiency assessment**
	2	C	1		*DPLT*
1	2	C	1	a	Needs to be less military specific
1	2	C	1	b	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
1	2	C	1	c	is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
2	2	C	1	d	needs improvement
	2	C	1	e	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
5	2	C	1	f	other
	2	C	1	g	is not a valid measure of usage in the field

	2	C	2	*On the need for speaking to be assessed*
4	2	C	2 a	Needs to incorporate speaking into DPLT some way/Use OPI
1	2	C	2 d	other comments
	2	C	3	*OPI*
	2	C	3 a	Is a good test
1	2	C	3 b	Is too subjective
1	2	C	3 c	other comments
	2	C	5	Other

	2	**D**		**Issues with specific programs**
	2	D	1	*DLI Arabic program*
	2	D	1 b	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
	2	D	1 c	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
	2	D	1 e	other comments
	2	D	3	*DLI courses in general*
	2	D	3 c	other comments
	2	D	4	*Berlitz*
	2	D	4 a	Korean program had a good emphasis on conversational language which was helpful
	2	D	4 b	other comments
	2	D	5	*SWC*
	2	D	5 a	Not enough focus on military language
	2	D	5 b	Not long enough
	2	D	5 c	other comments
	2	D	6	*other programs*
1	2	D	6 a	other comments
	2			
	2	**E**		**Special Issues with reservists:**

	2	E	1		*training timing*
5	2	E	1	a	should take place right after all other & basic training
3	2	E	1	b	other comments
	2	E	2		*time concerns*
2	2	E	2	a	during drill weekends, there is no time for language drills
5	2	E	2	b	going to DLI for a year is not feasible for many/most reservists
3	2	E	2	c	other comments
	2	E	3		*Language requirements*
3	2	E	3	a	should be required
10	2	E	3	b	there is no pre-deployment training - it should be required as well.
3	2	E	3	c	other comments
	2	E	4		*pay issues*
4	2	E	4	a	given lack of time during drills, consider paying people to study on their own time
2	2	E	4	b	FLPP is really low for reservists
3	2	E	4	c	FLPP is not a motivator for reservists
2	2	E	4	d	better FLPP would motivate reservists to study on their own
4	2	E	4	e	other pay comments
1	2	E	4	f	should be paid at lower proficiency levels than enlisted persons
	2	E	5		*immersion training*
2	2	E	5	a	there is very little opportunity for emersion in reserves, needs to be more
2	2	E	5	b	many reservists don't believe immersion is possible for them
3	2	E	5	c	other
	2	E	6		*training options*
2	2	E	6	a	need a wide range
6	2	E	6	c	local training programs might be an option
4	2	E	6	d	very few slots for DLI and other programs are available
6	2	E	6	e	other

	2	E	7		*support from command (or higher levels)*
1	2	E	7	a	not much
2	2	E	7	b	some
6	2	E	7	d	not at all
	2	E	8		*technology*
11	2	E	8	d	other technology-related comments

Appendix X:

Frequency Results for PO Active Duty Block 3

Freq	Categories					
	3	A				**Mission language requirement**
	3	A	1			**which language skills are relevant**
	3	A	1	a		*#1 priority*
	3	A	1	a	1	speaking
	3	A	1	a	2	listening
	3	A	1	a	3	writing
	3	A	1	a	4	reading
2	3	A	1	a	6	other
	3	A	1	b		*#2 priority*
	3	A	1	b	1	speaking
	3	A	1	b	2	listening
	3	A	1	b	3	writing
	3	A	1	b	4	reading
	3	A	1	b	6	other
	3	A	1	c		*#3 priority*
	3	A	1	c	1	speaking
	3	A	1	c	2	listening
	3	A	1	c	3	writing
	3	A	1	c	4	reading
	3	A	1	c	6	other
	3	A	1	d		*#4 priority*
	3	A	1	d	1	speaking
	3	A	1	d	2	listening
	3	A	1	d	3	writing
	3	A	1	d	4	reading

	3	A	1	d	6	other
	3	A				**what proficiency levels are needed**
1	3	A	2			1-1
1	3	A	3			2-2
	3	A	4			3-3
	3	A	5			can have a variety within a given unit
2	3	A	6			other
	3	B				**Where training fits into the career lifecycle**
	3	B	1			**school training**
	3	B	1	a		*when in pipeline?*
	3	B	1	a	1	early - as part of some of the first training that occurs
3	3	B	1	a	2	late but before being sent to unit - just before send off to unit
	3	B	1	a	3	very late - after sent to unit (to prevent burnout)
	3	B	1	a	4	other
	3	B	1	c		*primary emphasis should be?*
	3	B	1	c	1	military language
	3	B	1	c	2	street language
	3	B	1	c	3	equal mix
1	3	B	1	c	4	other
	3	B	3			**maintenance**
	3	B	3	a		*type?*
	3	B	3	a	1	language lab
1	3	B	3	a	2	DL
	3	B	3	a	3	college classes
1	3	B	3	a	4	immersion
	3	B	3	a	5	classroom (DLI, etc.)
4	3	B	3	a	6	language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)

1	3	B	3	a	7		other
	3	B	3	b			*how often?*
	3	B	3	b	1		weekly
	3	B	3	b	3		monthly
	3	B	3	b	5		other
	3	B	3	b	6		annually
	3	B	3	d			*issues in maintenance*
	3	B	3	d	2		should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
	3	B	3	d	4		other

	3	C				**The most effective training options for initial acquisition and sustainment/enhancement training**
	3	C	1			*for initial acquisition*
	3	C	1	a		classroom
	3	C	1	b		classroom/immersion combo
	3	C	1	c		other
	3	C	2			*for sustaining/enhancing*
	3	C	2	a		immersion
	3	C	2	d		other
	3	D				**Should training be voluntary or involuntary**
	3	D	1			mandatory for all
	3	D	3			voluntary
	3	D	5			based on aptitude/interest
	3	D	6			basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
	3	D	8			other
	3	F				**Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities**
	3	F	1			*What are these barriers?*
1	3	F	1	a		financial costs of training

1	3	F	1	b	no time for dedicated long period of language training
	3	F	1	c	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
	3	F	1	d	no language lab
	3	F	1	e	low priority for leadership
1	3	F	1	f	time not being used efficiently
1	3	F	1	g	other
	3	F	1	h	other lack of resources
	3	F	1	i	lack of awareness of resources
	3	F	1	k	no structured program / maintenance
	3	F	2		*How can they be removed?*
	3	F	2	a	discretionary language funds for units
	3	F	2	b	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
	3	F	2	c	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
	3	F	2	d	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
	3	F	2	e	other
	3	G			**What would you recommend to motivate improved language proficiency?**
	3	G	1		*pay*
	3	G	1	a	pay based on language difficulty
	3	G	1	b	no cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated
1	3	G	1	c	pay separately for proficiency in speaking than in listening/reading comprehension
	3	G	1	d	pay based on the number of years you have maintained proficiency
	3	G	1	e	more pay using current compensation system
	3	G	1	g	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
5	3	G	1	h	other
	3	G	2		*practical use*
	3	G	2	a	make sure they will be used in the field
	3	G	2	b	other

	3	G	3		*recognition*
	3	G	3	a	any type
	3	G	4		*other*
	3	G	4	a	try and select those with prior language exposure
1	3	G	4	b	other
	3	G	4	c	hold people accountable
	3	H			**Ways to improve training**
	3	H	1		instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
	3	H	3		allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
	3	H	4		SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
	3	H	6		Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
2	3	H	7		Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
1	3	H	8		Keep class size small (under 10)
	3	H	9		other comments
1	3	H	10		Make proficiency a requirement to be eligible to deploy
1	3	H	11		Actually practice training sessions (they will be done down-range) in the native language stateside
	3	H	12		CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
	3	H	13		Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
3	3	H	14		other comments
	3	H	15		Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
	3	H	16		Imersion training is best

Appendix Y:

Frequency Results for PO Reserve Duty Block 3

Freq	Categories					
	3	A				**Mission language requirement**
	3	A	1			**which language skills are relevant**
	3	A	1	a		*#1 priority*
3	3	A	1	a	1	speaking
1	3	A	1	a	2	listening
	3	A	1	a	3	writing
	3	A	1	a	4	reading
1	3	A	1	a	6	other
	3	A	1	b		*#2 priority*
	3	A	1	b	1	speaking
1	3	A	1	b	2	listening
	3	A	1	b	3	writing
	3	A	1	b	4	reading
	3	A	1	b	6	other
	3	A	1	c		*#3 priority*
	3	A	1	c	1	speaking
	3	A	1	c	2	listening
	3	A	1	c	3	writing
1	3	A	1	c	4	reading
	3	A	1	c	6	other
	3	A	1	d		*#4 priority*
	3	A	1	d	1	speaking
	3	A	1	d	2	listening
1	3	A	1	d	3	writing
	3	A	1	d	4	reading

	3	A	1	d	6		other
	3	A					**what proficiency levels are needed**
2	3	A	2				1-1
	3	A	3				2-2
	3	A	4				3-3
1	3	A	5				can have a variety within a given unit
3	3	A	6				other
	3	B					**Where training fits into the career lifecycle**
	3	B	1				**school training**
	3	B	1	a			*when in pipeline?*
2	3	B	1	a	1		early - as part of some of the first training that occurs
1	3	B	1	a	2		late but before being sent to unit - just before send off to unit
	3	B	1	a	3		very late - after sent to unit (to prevent burnout)
2	3	B	1	a	4		other
	3	B	1	c			*primary emphasis should be?*
	3	B	1	c	1		military language
1	3	B	1	c	2		street language
	3	B	1	c	3		equal mix
	3	B	1	c	4		other
	3	B	3				**maintenance**
	3	B	3	a			*type?*
	3	B	3	a	1		language lab
1	3	B	3	a	2		DL
4	3	B	3	a	3		college classes
4	3	B	3	a	4		immersion
3	3	B	3	a	5		classroom (DLI, etc.)
	3	B	3	a	6		language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)

2	3	B	3	a	7	other
	3	B	3	b		*how often?*
	3	B	3	b	1	weekly
	3	B	3	b	3	monthly
	3	B	3	b	5	other
1	3	B	3	b	6	annually
	3	B	3	d		*issues in maintenance*
1	3	B	3	d	2	should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
1	3	B	3	d	4	other
	3	**C**				**The most effective training options for initial acquisition and sustainment/enhancement training**
	3	C	1			*for initial acquisition*
2	3	C	1	a		classroom
1	3	C	1	b		classroom/immersion combo
8	3	C	1	c		other
	3	C	2			*for sustaining/enhancing*
	3	C	2	a		immersion
1	3	C	2	d		other
	3	**D**				**Should training be voluntary or involuntary**
5	3	D	1			mandatory for all
	3	D	3			voluntary
	3	D	5			based on aptitude/interest
1	3	D	6			basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
1	3	D	8			other
	3	**F**				**Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities**
	3	F	1			*What are these barriers?*
5	3	F	1	a		financial costs of training

2	3	F	1	b	no time for dedicated long period of language training
	3	F	1	c	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
1	3	F	1	d	no language lab
2	3	F	1	e	low priority for leadership
1	3	F	1	f	time not being used efficiently
5	3	F	1	g	other
	3	F	1	h	other lack of resources
5	3	F	1	i	lack of awareness of resources
	3	F	1	k	no structured program / maintenance
	3	F	2		*How can they be removed?*
5	3	F	2	a	discretionary language funds for units
4	3	F	2	b	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
	3	F	2	c	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
1	3	F	2	d	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
3	3	F	2	e	other
	3	G			**What would you recommend to motivate improved language proficiency?**
	3	G	1		*pay*
	3	G	1	a	pay based on language difficulty
	3	G	1	b	no cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated
	3	G	1	c	pay separately for proficiency in speaking than in listening/reading comprehension
1	3	G	1	d	pay based on the number of years you have maintained proficiency
1	3	G	1	e	more pay using current compensation system
	3	G	1	g	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
4	3	G	1	h	other
	3	G	2		*practical use*
1	3	G	2	a	make sure they will be used in the field
1	3	G	2	b	other

	3	G	3		*recognition*
	3	G	3	a	any type
	3	G	4		*other*
	3	G	4	a	try and select those with prior language exposure
4	3	G	4	b	other
	3	G	4	c	hold people accountable
	3	H			**Ways to improve training**
	3	H	1		instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
	3	H	3		allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
	3	H	4		SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
2	3	H	6		Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
1	3	H	7		Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
	3	H	8		Keep class size small (under 10)
	3	H	9		other comments
	3	H	10		Make proficiency a requirement to be eligible to deploy
	3	H	11		Actually practice training sessions (they will be done down-range) in the native language stateside
	3	H	12		CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
	3	H	13		Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
3	3	H	14		other comments
	3	H	15		Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
	3	H	16		Imersion training is best

Appendix Z:

Frequency Results for Navy SEALs Block 1

Freq	Categories				
	1	A			**Q1: "Tell us about a situation were having language skills and capabilities contributed to mission success?"**
	1	A	1		*Tasks performed?*
6	1	A	1	a	Training others
7	1	A	1	b	Missions
4	1	A	1	c	other
	1	A	2		*Which language was required of the mission:*
6	1	A	2	a	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
1	1	A	2	b	National language
	1	A	2	c	Specific local dialect
	1	A	2	d	other
	1	A	3		*Level of proficiency required on the mission*
3	1	A	3	a	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases - listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
	1	A	3	b	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
1	1	A	3	c	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful
	1	A	3	e	other
	1	A	5		*How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?*
	1	A	5	a	Not at all
1	1	A	5	b	A little
1	1	A	5	c	A moderate amount
1	1	A	5	d	A lot
	1	A	6		*Proficiencies needed?*
3	1	A	6	a	General language (around town)
5	1	A	6	b	Technical-job related or military terms
	1	A	6	c	other
	1	A	7		*Which is more important?*

15	1	A	7	a				Speaking
1	1	A	7	b				Reading
1	1	A	7	c				Writing
5	1	A	7	d				Listening
	1	A	7	e				other
	1	A	8					*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
2	1	A	8	b				Helpful but not essential
6	1	A	8	c				Essential
	1	A	8	d				other
	1	A	9					*Do the natives typically speak English*
1	1	A	9	a				Most of them
	1	A	9	b				Some of them
1	1	A	9	c				Few of them
2	1	A	9	d				None of them
	1	A	11					***Did you use job aids (e.g., Kwikpoint) to help prepare? If yes, what's your evaluation of the job aid?***
	1	A	11	a				**translators/interpreters**
	1	A	11	a	1			*How often*
1	1	A	11	a	1	a		yes - local interpreters, frequently
	1	A	11	a	1	b		yes - local interpreters, infrequently
	1	A	11	a	1	c		yes - military provided interpreters, frequently
	1	A	11	a	1	d		yes - military provided interpreters, infrequently
	1	A	11	a	1	e		rarely used interpreters
	1	A	11	a	2			*How important is it to use interpreters*
	1	A	11	a	2	a		Essential
1	1	A	11	a	2	b		Helpful
	1	A	11	a	2	c		Of little use
	1	A	11	a	3			*Issues in selecting interpreter*

1	1	A	11	a	3	a		Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
1	1	A	11	a	3	b		Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
	1	A	11	a	3	c		As long as they speak English their OK
	1	A	11	a	3	d		Proper selection interpreters is important
1	1	A	11	a	3	f		Can't trust interpreters
	1	A	11	a	3	g		other interpreter issues
	1	A	11	d			**Note cards with phrases**	
1	1	A	11	d	1			sometime
	1	A	11	d	2			always
	1	A	11	d	3			other
	1	A	11	e			**jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal**	
	1	A	11	e	1			on occasion
5	1	A	11	F			**other**	
	1	C					*General Themes:*	
	1	C	1				*Additional Language Training Needs*	
7	1	C	1	a			Spoken	
1	1	C	1	b			Written	
	1	C	1	d			Street/slang	
2	1	C	1	e			Formal/presentation language	
	1	C	1	f			Flexibility - broad range of skills	
	1	C	1	g			Cultural language training	
2	1	C	1	h			Cultural non-verbal language training	
	1	C	1	i			Dialect Training	
1	1	C	1	j			Immersion training	
	1	C	1	k			More time in formal classes	
	1	C	1	n			Other	
	1	C	2				*Benefits of proficiency:*	

	1	C	2	a		*Basic*
4	1	C	2	a	1	Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
2	1	C	2	a	2	Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
1	1	C	2	a	3	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	1	C	2	b		*More advanced*
4	1	C	2	b	2	Identifying important documents in another language
	1	C	2	b	3	Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
5	1	C	2	b	4	Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
1	1	C	2	b	5	other
	1	C	2	c		*Unspecified*
6	1	C	2	c	1	Builds rapport/trust
3	1	C	2	c	2	Enhances communication effectiveness
6	1	C	2	c	3	Increases efficiency/speed of mission
1	1	C	2	c	5	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
6	1	C	2	c	6	Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
1	1	C	2	c	7	Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
8	1	C	2	c	8	Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
	1	C	2	D		other
	1	C	3			***Consequences of a lack of proficiency:***
8	1	C	3	a		Can be dangerous
3	1	C	3	b		May causes mission abort/failure
4	1	C	3	c		May slow mission
2	1	C	3	d		May decrease mission effectiveness
4	1	C	3	e		May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)
	1	C	3	f		Can lead to selection of inappropriate translator
11	1	D				***Other comments:***
13	4					***incomplete data - not able to code in any block***

Appendix AA:

Frequency Results for Navy SEALs Block 2

Freq	Categories				
	2	A			**General issues in training effectiveness**
	2	A	1		*with immersion*
	2	A	1	a	timing (too long before deployment)
9	2	A	1	b	immersed with others or by self
5	2	A	1	d	cultural aspect of immersion is important
3	2	A	1	f	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
3	2	A	1	g	other
	2	A	2		*that contribute to a lack of preparation*
1	2	A	2	a	missions in many locations
4	2	A	2	b	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
2	2	A	2	c	other
	2	A	3		*tools to use in training/preparation*
5	2	A	3	a	reading - to build vocabulary
1	2	A	3	b	language labs are very valuable
	2	A	3	c	other
	2	A	5		*Why do people learn languages*
2	2	A	5	a	Current pay is not a strong motivator
1	2	A	5	b	Pride / wanting to do a better job
2	2	A	5	c	To make missions easier on themselves
	2	A	5	d	Pay
8	2	A	5	e	other
	2	A	6		*Other*
	2	B			*"Classroom training and live emersion training (LET) programs are not always available. Is distributive learning (DL) or technology-delivered training (TDT) a viable option for training language?" Give example if necessary.*
	2	B	1		*possible alternatives to traditional training*

1	2	B	1	a		pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
1	2	B	1	b		tutoring in specific languages
2	2	B	1	d		immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site
10	2	B	1	e		other
	2	B	2			*Issues*
2	2	B	2	a		immersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks.
1	2	B	2	b		DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them
1	2	B	2	c		other
	2	B	3			*would DL, TDT solutions be effective*
	2	B	3	a		maybe a little
1	2	B	3	c		yes, anything helps
	2	B	3	d		other
	2	B	4			*other comments about DL,TDT*
	2	B	4	a		Rosetta stone program is really helpful
	2	B	4	c		other
1	2	B	5			*DL, TDT not very effective*
	2	B	6			*DL, etc. should be more widely available*
1	2	C				**Issues in proficiency assessment**
	2	C	1			*DPLT*
	2	C	1	a		Needs to be less military specific
1	2	C	1	b		Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
	2	C	1	c		is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
	2	C	1	d		needs improvement
	2	C	1	e		lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
	2	C	1	g		is not a valid measure of usage in the field
	2	C	2			*On the need for speaking to be assessed*

	Code			Description
	2	C 2 a		Needs to incorporate speaking into DPLT some way/Use OPI
1	2	C 2 d		other comments
	2	C 3		*OPI*
	2	C 3 a		Is a good test
	2	C 3 b		Is too subjective
	2	C 3 c		other comments
	2	C 5		Other

	Code		Description
	2 D		**Issues with specific programs**
	2 D 1		*DLI Arabic program*
1	2 D 1	b	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
	2 D 1	c	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
	2 D 1	e	other comments
	2 D 3		*DLI courses in general*
3	2 D 3	a	Need a greater speaking focus
	2 D 3	b	Spend too much time teaching specifically for DPLT
12	2 D 3	c	other comments
	2 D 4		*Berlitz*
2	2 D 4	a	Korean program had a good emphasis on conversational language which was helpful
	2 D 4	b	other comments
	2 D 5		*SWC*
1	2 D 5	a	Not enough focus on military language
	2 D 5	b	Not long enough
	2 D 5	c	other comments
	2 D 6		*other programs*
3	2 D 6	a	other comments
	2		

2	E			**Special Issues with reservists:**
2	E	1		*training timing*
2	E	1	a	should take place right after all other & basic training
2	E	1	b	other comments
2	E	2		*time concerns*
2	E	2	a	during drill weekends, there is no time for language drills
2	E	2	b	going to DLI for a year is not feasible for many/most reservists
2	E	2	c	other comments
2	E	3		*Language requirements*
2	E	3	a	should be required
2	E	3	b	there is no pre-deployment training - it should be required as well.
2	E	3	c	other comments
2	E	4		*pay issues*
2	E	4	a	given lack of time during drills, consider paying people to study on their own time
2	E	4	b	FLPP is really low for reservists
2	E	4	c	FLPP is not a motivator for reservists
2	E	4	d	better FLPP would motivate reservists to study on their own
2	E	4	e	other pay comments
2	E	4	f	should be paid at lower proficiency levels than enlisted persons
2	E	5		*immersion training*
2	E	5	a	there is very little opportunity for emersion in reserves, needs to be more
2	E	5	b	many reservists don't believe immersion is possible for them
2	E	5	c	other
2	E	6		*training options*
2	E	6	a	need a wide range
2	E	6	c	local training programs might be an option
2	E	6	d	very few slots for DLI and other programs are available

2	E	6	e	other
2	E	7		*support from command (or higher levels)*
2	E	7	a	not much
2	E	7	b	some
2	E	7	d	not at all
2	E	8		*technology*
2	E	8	d	other technology-related comments

Appendix AB:

Frequency Results for Navy SEALs Block 3

Freq	Categories					
	3	A				**Mission language requirement**
	3	A	1			**which language skills are relevant**
	3	A	1	a		*#1 priority*
5	3	A	1	a	1	speaking
1	3	A	1	a	2	listening
	3	A	1	a	3	writing
	3	A	1	a	4	reading
1	3	A	1	a	6	other
	3	A	1	b		*#2 priority*
	3	A	1	b	1	speaking
1	3	A	1	b	2	listening
	3	A	1	b	3	writing
1	3	A	1	b	4	reading
	3	A	1	b	6	other
	3	A	1	c		*#3 priority*
	3	A	1	c	1	speaking
	3	A	1	c	2	listening
1	3	A	1	c	3	writing
2	3	A	1	c	4	reading
	3	A	1	c	6	other
	3	A	1	d		*#4 priority*
	3	A	1	d	1	speaking
	3	A	1	d	2	listening
	3	A	1	d	3	writing
	3	A	1	d	4	reading

	3	A	1	d	6	other
	3	A				**what proficiency levels are needed**
	3	A	2			1-1
2	3	A	3			2-2
2	3	A	4			3-3
1	3	A	5			can have a variety within a given unit
1	3	A	6			other
	3	B				**Where training fits into the career lifecycle**
	3	B	1			**school training**
2	3	B	1	a		*when in pipeline?*
4	3	B	1	a	1	early - as part of some of the first training that occurs
2	3	B	1	a	2	late but before being sent to unit - just before send off to unit
	3	B	1	a	3	very late - after sent to unit (to prevent burnout)
1	3	B	1	a	4	other
	3	B	1	c		*primary emphasis should be?*
3	3	B	1	c	1	military language
2	3	B	1	c	2	street language
	3	B	1	c	3	equal mix
	3	B	1	c	4	other
	3	B	3			**maintenance**
	3	B	3	a		*type?*
1	3	B	3	a	1	language lab
1	3	B	3	a	2	DL
	3	B	3	a	3	college classes
2	3	B	3	a	4	immersion
2	3	B	3	a	5	classroom (DLI, etc.)
	3	B	3	a	6	language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)

1	3	B	3	a	7	other
	3	B	3	b		*how often?*
	3	B	3	b	1	weekly
	3	B	3	b	3	monthly
1	3	B	3	b	5	other
	3	B	3	b	6	annually
	3	B	3	d		*issues in maintenance*
1	3	B	3	d	2	should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
1	3	B	3	d	4	other
	3	C				**The most effective training options for initial acquisition and sustainment/enhancement training**
	3	C	1			*for initial acquisition*
3	3	C	1	a		classroom
3	3	C	1	b		classroom/immersion combo
	3	C	1	c		other
1	3	C	2			*for sustaining/enhancing*
2	3	C	2	a		immersion
1	3	C	2	d		other
	3	D				**Should training be voluntary or involuntary**
3	3	D	1			mandatory for all
	3	D	3			voluntary
1	3	D	5			based on aptitude/interest
9	3	D	6			basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
1	3	D	8			other
	3	F				**Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities**
	3	F	1			*What are these barriers?*
1	3	F	1	a		financial costs of training

3	3	F	1	b	no time for dedicated long period of language training
2	3	F	1	c	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
	3	F	1	d	no language lab
4	3	F	1	e	low priority for leadership
1	3	F	1	f	time not being used efficiently
2	3	F	1	g	other
	3	F	1	h	other lack of resources
1	3	F	1	i	lack of awareness of resources
	3	F	1	k	No structured program/maintenance
	3	F	2		*How can they be removed?*
	3	F	2	a	discretionary language funds for units
4	3	F	2	b	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
	3	F	2	c	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
	3	F	2	d	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
2	3	F	2	e	other
	3	G			**What would you recommend to motivate improved language proficiency?**
	3	G	1		*pay*
	3	G	1	a	pay based on language difficulty
	3	G	1	b	no cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated
1	3	G	1	c	pay separately for proficiency in speaking than in listening/reading comprehension
	3	G	1	d	pay based on the number of years you have maintained proficiency
3	3	G	1	e	more pay using current compensation system
	3	G	1	g	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
1	3	G	1	h	other
	3	G	2		*practical use*
1	3	G	2	a	make sure they will be used in the field
	3	G	2	b	other

	3	G	3		*recognition*
1	3	G	3	a	any type
	3	G	4		*other*
2	3	G	4	a	try and select those with prior language exposure
	3	G	4	b	other
	3	G	4	c	hold people accountable
	3	H			**Ways to improve training**
	3	H	1		instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
1	3	H	3		allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
	3	H	4		SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
3	3	H	6		Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
	3	H	7		Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
	3	H	8		Keep class size small (under 10)
	3	H	9		other comments
	3	H	10		Make proficiency a requirement to be eligible to deploy
	3	H	11		Actually practice training sessions (they will be done down-range) in the native language stateside
	3	H	12		CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
	3	H	13		Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
3	3	H	14		other comments
1	3	H	15		Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
	3	H	16		Imersion training is best

Appendix AC:

Frequency Results for Navy SWCC Block 1

Freq	Categories				
	1	A			**Q1: "Tell us about a situation were having language skills and capabilities contributed to mission success?"**
	1	A	1		*Tasks performed?*
8	1	A	1	a	Training others
	1	A	1	b	Missions
	1	A	1	c	other
	1	A	2		*Which language was required of the mission:*
3	1	A	2	a	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
1	1	A	2	b	National language
	1	A	2	c	Specific local dialect
	1	A	2	d	other
	1	A	3		*Level of proficiency required on the mission*
	1	A	3	a	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases - listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
	1	A	3	b	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
	1	A	3	c	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful
	1	A	3	e	other
	1	A	5		*How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?*
	1	A	5	a	Not at all
	1	A	5	b	A little
	1	A	5	c	A moderate amount
	1	A	5	d	A lot
	1	A	6		*Proficiencies needed?*
1	1	A	6	a	General language (around town)
5	1	A	6	b	Technical-job related or military terms
1	1	A	6	c	other
	1	A	7		*Which is more important?*

4	1	A	7	a				Speaking
	1	A	7	b				Reading
	1	A	7	c				Writing
2	1	A	7	d				Listening
	1	A	7	e				other
	1	A	8					*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
4	1	A	8	b				Helpful but not essential
2	1	A	8	c				Essential
	1	A	8	d				other
	1	A	9					*Do the natives typically speak English*
	1	A	9	a				Most of them
	1	A	9	b				Some of them
	1	A	9	c				Few of them
	1	A	9	d				None of them
	1	A	11					***Did you use job aids (e.g., Kwikpoint) to help prepare? If yes, what's your evaluation of the job aid?***
	1	A	11	a				**translators/interpreters**
	1	A	11	a	1			*How often*
	1	A	11	a	1	a		yes - local interpreters, frequently
	1	A	11	a	1	b		yes - local interpreters, infrequently
1	1	A	11	a	1	c		yes - military provided interpreters, frequently
	1	A	11	a	1	d		yes - military provided interpreters, infrequently
	1	A	11	a	1	e		rarely used interpreters
	1	A	11	a	2			*How important is it to use interpreters*
1	1	A	11	a	2	a		Essential
	1	A	11	a	2	b		Helpful
	1	A	11	a	2	c		Of little use
	1	A	11	a	3			*Issues in selecting interpreter*

	1	A	11	a	3	a		Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
	1	A	11	a	3	b		Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
	1	A	11	a	3	c		As long as they speak English their OK
	1	A	11	a	3	d		Proper selection interpreters is important
2	1	A	11	a	3	f		Can't trust interpreters
	1	A	11	a	3	g		other interpreter issues
	1	A	11	d				**Note cards with phrases**
	1	A	11	d	1			sometime
	1	A	11	d	2			always
	1	A	11	d	3			other
	1	A	11	e				**jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal**
	1	A	11	e	1			on occasion
	1	A	11	F				**other**
	1	C						*General Themes:*
	1	C	1					*Additional Language Training Needs*
1	1	C	1	a				Spoken
	1	C	1	b				Written
1	1	C	1	d				Street/slang
2	1	C	1	e				Formal/presentation language
	1	C	1	f				Flexibility - broad range of skills
1	1	C	1	g				Cultural language training
1	1	C	1	h				Cultural non-verbal language training
	1	C	1	i				Dialect Training
1	1	C	1	j				Immersion training
	1	C	1	k				More time in formal classes
4	1	C	1	n				Other
	1	C	2					*Benefits of proficiency:*

	1	C	2	a			*Basic*
	1	C	2	a	1		Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
	1	C	2	a	2		Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
1	1	C	2	a	3		Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	1	C	2	b			*More advanced*
	1	C	2	b	2		Identifying important documents in another language
	1	C	2	b	3		Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
	1	C	2	b	4		Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
	1	C	2	b	5		other
	1	C	2	c			*Unspecified*
2	1	C	2	c	1		Builds rapport/trust
	1	C	2	c	2		Enhances communication effectiveness
	1	C	2	c	3		Increases efficiency/speed of mission
1	1	C	2	c	5		Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	1	C	2	c	6		Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
	1	C	2	c	7		Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
	1	C	2	c	8		Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
	1	C	2	D			other
	1	C	3				***Consequences of a lack of proficiency:***
4	1	C	3	a			Can be dangerous
1	1	C	3	b			May causes mission abort/failure
1	1	C	3	c			May slow mission
1	1	C	3	d			May decrease mission effectiveness
1	1	C	3	e			May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)
	1	C	3	f			Can lead to selection of inappropriate translator
1	1	D					***Other comments:***
10	4						***incomplete data - not able to code (across all blocks)***

Appendix AD:

Frequency Results for Navy SWCC Block 2

Freq	Categories				
	2	A			**General issues in training effectiveness**
	2	A	1		*with immersion*
3	2	A	1	a	timing (too long before deployment)
1	2	A	1	b	immersed with others or by self
3	2	A	1	d	cultural aspect of immersion is important
	2	A	1	f	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
3	2	A	1	g	other
	2	A	2		*that contribute to a lack of preparation*
	2	A	2	a	missions in many locations
3	2	A	2	b	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
2	2	A	2	c	other
	2	A	3		*tools to use in training/preparation*
	2	A	3	a	reading - to build vocabulary
	2	A	3	b	language labs are very valuable
2	2	A	3	c	other
	2	A	5		*Why do people learn languages*
	2	A	5	a	Current pay is not a strong motivator
	2	A	5	b	Pride / wanting to do a better job
5	2	A	5	c	To make missions easier on themselves
	2	A	5	d	Pay
2	2	A	5	e	other
1	2	A	6		*other*
	2	B			*"Classroom training and live emersion training (LET) programs are not always available. Is distributive learning (DL) or technology-delivered training (TDT) a viable option for training language?" Give example if necessary.*
	2	B	1		*possible alternatives to traditional training*

	2	B	1	a	pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
1	2	B	1	b	tutoring in specific languages
1	2	B	1	d	immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site
	2	B	1	e	other
	2	B	2		*Issues*
	2	B	2	a	immersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks.
	2	B	2	b	DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them
	2	B	2	c	other
	2	B	3		*would DL, TDT solutions be effective*
	2	B	3	a	maybe a little
	2	B	3	c	yes, anything helps
	2	B	3	d	other
	2	B	4		*other comments about DL, TDT*
	2	B	4	a	Rosetta stone program is really helpful
	2	B	4	c	other
	2	B	5		*DL, TDT not very effective*
	2	B	6		*DL, etc. should be more widely available*

	2	C			**Issues in proficiency assessment**
	2	C	1		*DPLT*
	2	C	1	a	Needs to be less military specific
	2	C	1	b	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
	2	C	1	c	is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
	2	C	1	d	needs improvement
	2	C	1	e	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
1	2	C	1	f	other
3	2	C	1	g	is not a valid measure of usage in the field

	2	C	2		*On the need for speaking to be assessed*
1	2	C	2	a	Needs to incorporate speaking into DPLT some way/Use OPI
	2	C	2	d	other comments
	2	C	3		*OPI*
	2	C	3	a	Is a good test
	2	C	3	b	Is too subjective
	2	C	3	c	other comments
	2	C	5		Other

	2	D			**Issues with specific programs**
	2	D	1		*DLI Arabic program*
	2	D	1	b	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
	2	D	1	c	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
	2	D	1	e	other comments
	2	D	3		*DLI courses in general*
	2	D	3	a	Need a greater speaking focus
	2	D	3	b	Spend too much time teaching specifically for DPLT
1	2	D	3	c	other comments
	2	D	4		*Berlitz*
	2	D	4	a	Korean program had a good emphasis on conversational language which was helpful
	2	D	4	b	other comments
	2	D	5		*SWC*
	2	D	5	a	Not enough focus on military language
	2	D	5	b	Not long enough
	2	D	5	c	other comments
	2	D	6		*other programs*
	2	D	6	a	other comments

2				
2	E			**Special Issues with reservists:**
2	E	1		*training timing*
2	E	1	a	should take place right after all other & basic training
2	E	1	b	other comments
2	E	2		*time concerns*
2	E	2	a	during drill weekends, there is no time for language drills
2	E	2	b	going to DLI for a year is not feasible for many/most reservists
2	E	2	c	other comments
2	E	3		*Language requirements*
2	E	3	a	should be required
2	E	3	b	there is no pre-deployment training - it should be required as well.
2	E	3	c	other comments
2	E	4		*pay issues*
2	E	4	a	given lack of time during drills, consider paying people to study on their own time
2	E	4	b	FLPP is really low for reservists
2	E	4	c	FLPP is not a motivator for reservists
2	E	4	d	better FLPP would motivate reservists to study on their own
2	E	4	e	other pay comments
2	E	4	f	should be paid at lower proficiency levels than enlisted persons
2	E	5		*immersion training*
2	E	5	a	there is very little opportunity for emersion in reserves, needs to be more
2	E	5	b	many reservists don't believe immersion is possible for them
2	E	5	c	other
2	E	6		*training options*
2	E	6	a	need a wide range
2	E	6	c	local training programs might be an option

2   E   6   d   very few slots for DLI and other programs are available

2   E   6   e   other

2   E   7   *support from command (or higher levels)*

2   E   7   a   not much

2   E   7   b   some

2   E   7   d   not at all

2   E   8   *technology*

2   E   8   d   other technology-related comments

Appendix AE:

Frequency Results for Navy SWCC Block 3

Freq		Categories					
	3	A					**Mission language requirement**
	3	A	1				**which language skills are relevant**
	3	A	1	a			*#1 priority*
3	3	A	1	a	1		speaking
	3	A	1	a	2		listening
	3	A	1	a	3		writing
	3	A	1	a	4		reading
	3	A	1	a	6		other
	3	A	1	b			*#2 priority*
	3	A	1	b	1		speaking
2	3	A	1	b	2		listening
	3	A	1	b	3		writing
	3	A	1	b	4		reading
	3	A	1	b	6		other
	3	A	1	c			*#3 priority*
	3	A	1	c	1		speaking
	3	A	1	c	2		listening
	3	A	1	c	3		writing
	3	A	1	c	4		reading
	3	A	1	c	6		other
	3	A	1	d			*#4 priority*
	3	A	1	d	1		speaking
	3	A	1	d	2		listening
	3	A	1	d	3		writing
	3	A	1	d	4		reading

	3	A	1	d	6	other
	3	A				**what proficiency levels are needed**
	3	A	2			1-1
2	3	A	3			2-2
	3	A	4			3-3
	3	A	5			can have a variety within a given unit
	3	A	6			other
	3	B				**Where training fits into the career lifecycle**
	3	B	1			**school training**
	3	B	1	a		*when in pipeline?*
1	3	B	1	a	1	early - as part of some of the first training that occurs
2	3	B	1	a	2	late but before being sent to unit - just before send off to unit
	3	B	1	a	3	very late - after sent to unit (to prevent burnout)
	3	B	1	a	4	other
	3	B	1	c		*primary emphasis should be?*
	3	B	1	c	1	military language
	3	B	1	c	2	street language
	3	B	1	c	3	equal mix
	3	B	1	c	4	other
	3	B	3			**maintenance**
	3	B	3	a		*type?*
3	3	B	3	a	1	language lab
	3	B	3	a	2	DL
	3	B	3	a	3	college classes
1	3	B	3	a	4	immersion
	3	B	3	a	5	classroom (DLI, etc.)
	3	B	3	a	6	language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)

1	3	B	3	a	7	other
	3	B	3	b		*how often?*
	3	B	3	b	1	weekly
1	3	B	3	b	3	monthly
1	3	B	3	b	5	other
	3	B	3	b	6	annually
	3	B	3	d		*issues in maintenance*
	3	B	3	d	2	should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
	3	B	3	d	4	other
	3	C				**The most effective training options for initial acquisition and sustainment/enhancement training**
	3	C	1			*for initial acquisition*
	3	C	1	a		classroom
1	3	C	1	b		classroom/immersion combo
	3	C	1	c		other
	3	C	2			*for sustaining/enhancing*
1	3	C	2	a		immersion
1	3	C	2	d		other
	3	D				**Should training be voluntary or involuntary**
3	3	D	1			mandatory for all
	3	D	3			voluntary
	3	D	5			based on aptitude/interest
2	3	D	6			basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
	3	D	8			other
	3	F				**Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities**
	3	F	1			*What are these barriers?*
2	3	F	1	a		financial costs of training

9	3	F	1	b	no time for dedicated long period of language training
	3	F	1	c	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
	3	F	1	d	no language lab
2	3	F	1	e	low priority for leadership
	3	F	1	f	time not being used efficiently
4	3	F	1	g	other
2	3	F	1	h	other lack of resources
	3	F	1	i	lack of awareness of resources
3	3	F	1	k	no structured program/maintenance
	3	F	2		*How can they be removed?*
1	3	F	2	a	discretionary language funds for units
1	3	F	2	b	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
	3	F	2	c	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
1	3	F	2	d	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
3	3	F	2	e	other
	3	G			**What would you recommend to motivate improved language proficiency?**
	3	G	1		*pay*
2	3	G	1	a	pay based on language difficulty
2	3	G	1	b	no cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated
	3	G	1	c	pay separately for proficiency in speaking than in listening/reading comprehension
	3	G	1	d	pay based on the number of years you have maintained proficiency
2	3	G	1	e	more pay using current compensation system
	3	G	1	g	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
1	3	G	1	h	other
	3	G	2		*practical use*
	3	G	2	a	make sure they will be used in the field
	3	G	2	b	other

	3	G	3		*recognition*
	3	G	3	a	any type
	3	G	4		*other*
	3	G	4	a	try and select those with prior language exposure
	3	G	4	b	other
	3	G	4	c	hold people accountable
	3	**H**			**Ways to improve training**
	3	H	1		instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
	3	H	3		allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
2	3	H	4		SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
1	3	H	6		Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
	3	H	7		Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
	3	H	8		Keep class size small (under 10)
	3	H	9		other comments
	3	H	10		Make proficiency a requirement to be eligible to deploy
	3	H	11		Actually practice training sessions (they will be done down-range) in the native language stateside
	3	H	12		CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
	3	H	13		Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
	3	H	14		other comments
	3	H	15		Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
	3	H	16		Imersion training is best

Appendix AF:

Frequency Results for Navy Special Operations Group Block 1

Freq	Categories				
	1	A			**Q1: "Tell us about a situation were having language skills and capabilities contributed to mission success?"**
	1	A	1		*Tasks performed?*
18	1	A	1	a	Training others
	1	A	1	b	Missions
	1	A	1	c	other
	1	A	2		*Which language was required of the mission:*
8	1	A	2	a	More general language (e.g. Spanish, French in colonial situations; Egyptian in Africa/mid-east)
1	1	A	2	b	National language
4	1	A	2	c	Specific local dialect
	1	A	2	d	other
	1	A	3		*Level of proficiency required on the mission*
	1	A	3	a	the example required 1-1 (basic few words/phrases - listening & reading proficiency) to be successful
	1	A	3	b	the example required 2-2 (more advanced) to be successful
	1	A	3	c	the example required 3-3 fluent to be successful
	1	A	3	e	other
	1	A	5		*How important is/was comprehension & proficiency to mission (vs. just putting forth an effort)?*
	1	A	5	a	Not at all
1	1	A	5	b	A little
	1	A	5	c	A moderate amount
2	1	A	5	d	A lot
	1	A	6		*Proficiencies needed?*
	1	A	6	a	General language (around town)
1	1	A	6	b	Technical-job related or military terms
	1	A	6	c	other
	1	A	7		*Which is more important?*

3	1	A	7	a					Speaking
	1	A	7	b					Reading
1	1	A	7	c					Writing
1	1	A	7	d					Listening
	1	A	7	e					other
	1	A	8						*How important is it to understand the cultural of the country?*
	1	A	8	b					Helpful but not essential
	1	A	8	c					Essential
	1	A	8	d					other
	1	A	9						*Do the natives typically speak English*
	1	A	9	a					Most of them
	1	A	9	b					Some of them
1	1	A	9	c					Few of them
	1	A	9	d					None of them
	1	A	11						***Did you use job aids (e.g., Kwikpoint) to help prepare? If yes, what's your evaluation of the job aid?***
	1	A	11	a					**translators/interpreters**
	1	A	11	a	1				*How often*
1	1	A	11	a	1	a			yes - local interpreters, frequently
	1	A	11	a	1	b			yes - local interpreters, infrequently
2	1	A	11	a	1	c			yes - military provided interpreters, frequently
	1	A	11	a	1	d			yes - military provided interpreters, infrequently
1	1	A	11	a	1	e			rarely used interpreters
	1	A	11	a	2				*How important is it to use interpreters*
1	1	A	11	a	2	a			Essential
	1	A	11	a	2	b			Helpful
	1	A	11	a	2	c			Of little use
	1	A	11	a	3				*Issues in selecting interpreter*

	1	A	11	a	3	a	Can hurt missing (if from opposing tribe/clan/family/religion/etc)
	1	A	11	a	3	b	Can be very helpful (from right clan, etc.)
	1	A	11	a	3	c	As long as they speak English their OK
	1	A	11	a	3	d	Proper selection interpreters is important
1	1	A	11	a	3	f	Can't trust interpreters
	1	A	11	a	3	g	other interpreter issues
	1	A	11	d			**Note cards with phrases**
	1	A	11	d	1		sometime
	1	A	11	d	2		always
	1	A	11	d	3		other
	1	A	11	e			**jesters, drawings, etc non-verbal**
1	1	A	11	e	1		on occasion
	1	A	11	F			**other**
	1	C					*General Themes:*
	1	C	1				*Additional Language Training Needs*
	1	C	1	a			Spoken
2	1	C	1	b			Written
	1	C	1	d			Street/slang
1	1	C	1	e			Formal/presentation language
1	1	C	1	f			Flexibility - broad range of skills
1	1	C	1	g			Cultural language training
	1	C	1	h			Cultural non-verbal language training
1	1	C	1	i			Dialect Training
	1	C	1	j			Immersion training
	1	C	1	k			More time in formal classes
	1	C	1	n			Other
	1	C	2				*Benefits of proficiency:*

	1	C	2	a		*Basic*
	1	C	2	a	1	Navigation (reading street signs, etc.)
	1	C	2	a	2	Maintain control over conflict situation with basic commands ("where is…" "get down.", etc.)
	1	C	2	a	3	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	1	C	2	b		*More advanced*
	1	C	2	b	2	Identifying important documents in another language
	1	C	2	b	3	Reduced personnel needs (e.g. translators)
	1	C	2	b	4	Gained information (e.g. eavesdropping when others don't know you speak the language)
	1	C	2	b	5	other
	1	C	2	c		*Unspecified*
4	1	C	2	c	1	Builds rapport/trust
	1	C	2	c	2	Enhances communication effectiveness
	1	C	2	c	3	Increases efficiency/speed of mission
	1	C	2	c	5	Shows respect/effort - builds instant credibility
	1	C	2	c	6	Increased situational awareness (read warning signs, etc.)
	1	C	2	c	7	Maintain control in armed confrontation (e.g. by saying "put the guns down", etc.)
	1	C	2	c	8	Gained information through better interpersonal relationships
	1	C	2	D		other
	1	C	3			***Consequences of a lack of proficiency:***
	1	C	3	a		Can be dangerous
	1	C	3	b		May causes mission abort/failure
	1	C	3	c		May slow mission
3	1	C	3	d		May decrease mission effectiveness
	1	C	3	e		May cause unnecessary damage (e.g. unnecessary destruction of property during wartime)
	1	C	3	f		Can lead to selection of inappropriate translator
4	1	D				***Other comments:***
8	4					***incomplete data - not able to code***

Appendix AG:

Frequency Results for Navy Special Operations Group Block 2

Freq	Categories				
	2	**A**			**General issues in training effectiveness**
	2	A	1		*with immersion*
	2	A	1	a	timing (too long before deployment)
1	2	A	1	b	immersed with others or by self
1	2	A	1	d	cultural aspect of immersion is important
	2	A	1	f	shouldn't require 3-3 before immersion. Everyone could benefit
7	2	A	1	g	other
	2	A	2		*that contribute to a lack of preparation*
1	2	A	2	a	missions in many locations
2	2	A	2	b	language is a lower priority than core job tasks
2	2	A	2	c	other
	2	A	3		*tools to use in training/preparation*
	2	A	3	a	reading - to build vocabulary
	2	A	3	b	language labs are very valuable
2	2	A	3	c	other
	2	A	5		*Why do people learn languages*
	2	A	5	a	Current pay is not a strong motivator
	2	A	5	b	Pride / wanting to do a better job
	2	A	5	c	To make missions easier on themselves
	2	A	5	d	Pay
1	2	A	5	e	other
	2	A	6		*other*
	2	B			*"Classroom training and live emersion training (LET) programs are not always available. Is distributive learning (DL) or technology-delivered training (TDT) a viable option for training language?" Give example if necessary.*
	2	B	1		*possible alternatives to traditional training*

	2	B	1	a	pair novice with experienced speaker for on-the-job language training
	2	B	1	b	tutoring in specific languages
	2	B	1	d	immersion training in USA in which only may speak x language at a particular site
	2	B	1	e	other
	2	B	2		*Issues*
	2	B	2	a	immersion is effective because you have time off from other tasks.
	2	B	2	b	DL, TDT would be effective if you could get time to do them
1	2	B	2	c	other
	2	B	3		*would DL, TDT solutions be effective*
	2	B	3	a	maybe a little
	2	B	3	c	yes, anything helps
	2	B	3	d	other
	2	B	4		*other comments about DL, TDT*
	2	B	4	a	Rosetta stone program is really helpful
	2	B	4	c	other
1	2	B	5		*DL, TDT not very effective*
	2	B	6		*DL, etc. should be more widely available*

	2	C			**Issues in proficiency assessment**
	2	C	1		*DPLT*
	2	C	1	a	Needs to be less military specific
1	2	C	1	b	Needs to focus more on military language (less on civilian)
	2	C	1	c	is a adequate/good measure of proficiency
4	2	C	1	d	needs improvement
1	2	C	1	e	lots of variation of proficiency within a level (e.g. good and bad speakers with 2-2 levels)
5	2	C	1	f	other
	2	C	1	g	is not a valid measure of usage in the field

	2	C	2		*On the need for speaking to be assessed*
1	2	C	2	a	Needs to incorporate speaking into DPLT some way/Use OPI
	2	C	2	d	other comments
	2	C	3		*OPI*
1	2	C	3	a	Is a good test
	2	C	3	b	Is too subjective
	2	C	3	c	other comments
	2	C	5		Other

	2	**D**			**Issues with specific programs**
	2	D	1		*DLI Arabic program*
	2	D	1	b	focuses too much on reading, not enough on speaking (is not SOF specific)
	2	D	1	c	Berlitz book/program doesn't represent Arabic as its used anywhere
	2	D	1	e	other comments
	2	D	3		*DLI courses in general*
1	2	D	3	a	Need a greater speaking focus
	2	D	3	b	Spend too much time teaching specifically for DPLT
	2	D	3	c	other comments
	2	D	4		*Berlitz*
	2	D	4	a	Korean program had a good emphasis on conversational language which was helpful
2	2	D	4	b	other comments
	2	D	5		*SWC*
	2	D	5	a	Not enough focus on military language
	2	D	5	b	Not long enough
	2	D	5	c	other comments
	2	D	6		*other programs*
3	2	D	6	a	other comments

2

2	E			**Special Issues with reservists:**
2	E	1		*training timing*
2	E	1	a	should take place right after all other & basic training
2	E	1	b	other comments
2	E	2		*time concerns*
2	E	2	a	during drill weekends, there is no time for language drills
2	E	2	b	going to DLI for a year is not feasible for many/most reservists
2	E	2	c	other comments
2	E	3		*Language requirements*
2	E	3	a	should be required
2	E	3	b	there is no pre-deployment training - it should be required as well.
2	E	3	c	other comments
2	E	4		*pay issues*
2	E	4	a	given lack of time during drills, consider paying people to study on their own time
2	E	4	b	FLPP is really low for reservists
2	E	4	c	FLPP is not a motivator for reservists
2	E	4	d	better FLPP would motivate reservists to study on their own
2	E	4	e	other pay comments
2	E	4	f	should be paid at lower proficiency levels than enlisted persons
2	E	5		*immersion training*
2	E	5	a	there is very little opportunity for emersion in reserves, needs to be more
2	E	5	b	many reservists don't believe immersion is possible for them
2	E	5	c	other
2	E	6		*training options*
2	E	6	a	need a wide range
2	E	6	c	local training programs might be an option

2 E 6 d   very few slots for DLI and other programs are available

2 E 6 e   other

2 E 7   *support from command (or higher levels)*

2 E 7 a   not much

2 E 7 b   some

2 E 7 d   not at all

2 E 8   *technology*

2 E 8 d   other technology-related comments

Appendix AH:

Frequency Results for Navy Special Operations Group Block 3

Freq	Categories					
	3	A				**Mission language requirement**
	3	A	1			**which language skills are relevant**
	3	A	1	a		*#1 priority*
1	3	A	1	a	1	speaking
	3	A	1	a	2	listening
	3	A	1	a	3	writing
	3	A	1	a	4	reading
	3	A	1	a	6	other
	3	A	1	b		*#2 priority*
	3	A	1	b	1	speaking
1	3	A	1	b	2	listening
	3	A	1	b	3	writing
	3	A	1	b	4	reading
	3	A	1	b	6	other
	3	A	1	c		*#3 priority*
	3	A	1	c	1	speaking
	3	A	1	c	2	listening
	3	A	1	c	3	writing
1	3	A	1	c	4	reading
	3	A	1	c	6	other
	3	A	1	d		*#4 priority*
	3	A	1	d	1	speaking
	3	A	1	d	2	listening
	3	A	1	d	3	writing
	3	A	1	d	4	reading
	3	A	1	d	6	other

	3	A					**what proficiency levels are needed**
	3	A	2				1-1
	3	A	3				2-2
1	3	A	4				3-3
	3	A	5				can have a variety within a given unit
	3	A	6				other
	3	B					**Where training fits into the career lifecycle**
	3	B	1				**school training**
	3	B	1	a			*when in pipeline?*
	3	B	1	a	1		early - as part of some of the first training that occurs
3	3	B	1	a	2		late but before being sent to unit - just before send off to unit
	3	B	1	a	3		very late - after sent to unit (to prevent burnout)
1	3	B	1	a	4		other
	3	B	1	c			*primary emphasis should be?*
1	3	B	1	c	1		military language
	3	B	1	c	2		street language
	3	B	1	c	3		equal mix
	3	B	1	c	4		other
	3	B	3				**maintenance/refresher**
	3	B	3	a			*type?*
1	3	B	3	a	1		language lab
	3	B	3	a	2		DL
	3	B	3	a	3		college classes
8	3	B	3	a	4		immersion
	3	B	3	a	5		classroom (DLI, etc.)
	3	B	3	a	6		language days/activities (everyone speaks only x language on this day/activity)
	3	B	3	a	7		other

	3	B	3	b		*how often?*
1	3	B	3	b	1	weekly
	3	B	3	b	3	monthly
1	3	B	3	b	5	other
1	3	B	3	b	6	annually
	3	B	3	d		*issues in maintenance*
	3	B	3	d	2	should give incentives or requirements for ongoing maintenance training
	3	B	3	d	4	other

	3	C				**The most effective training options for initial acquisition and sustainment/enhancement training**
	3	C	1			*for initial acquisition*
1	3	C	1	a		classroom
	3	C	1	b		classroom/immersion combo
	3	C	1	c		other
	3	C	2			*for sustaining/enhancing*
1	3	C	2	a		immersion
1	3	C	2	d		other
	3	D				**Should training be voluntary or involuntary**
	3	D	1			mandatory for all
1	3	D	3			voluntary
	3	D	5			based on aptitude/interest
	3	D	6			basics mandatory for all, more advanced voluntary
	3	D	8			other
	3	F				**Barriers that interfere with or prevent the development and maintenance of language capabilities**
	3	F	1			*What are these barriers?*
	3	F	1	a		financial costs of training
2	3	F	1	b		no time for dedicated long period of language training

	3	F	1	c	primary duties/Op Tempo (not enough personnel in unit to do job with someone gone for extended training)
	3	F	1	d	no language lab
2	3	F	1	e	low priority for leadership
	3	F	1	f	time not being used efficiently
	3	F	1	g	other
	3	F	1	h	other lack of resources
	3	F	1	i	lack of awareness of resources
1	3	F	1	k	no structured program/maintenance
	3	F	2		*How can they be removed?*
1	3	F	2	a	discretionary language funds for units
2	3	F	2	b	leaders make sure time is available for people to train/maintain
	3	F	2	c	proper facilities (e.g. language lab)
1	3	F	2	d	include specifics of maintenance plans in annual planning process
	3	F	2	e	other
	3	G			**What would you recommend to motivate improved language proficiency?**
	3	G	1		*pay*
2	3	G	1	a	pay based on language difficulty
1	3	G	1	b	no cap on the number of languages for which you can be compensated
1	3	G	1	c	pay separately for proficiency in speaking than in listening/reading comprehension
2	3	G	1	d	pay based on the number of years you have maintained proficiency
	3	G	1	e	more pay using current compensation system
1	3	G	1	g	pay is motivating as it currently is determined
8	3	G	1	h	other
	3	G	2		*practical use*
	3	G	2	a	make sure they will be used in the field
1	3	G	2	b	other
	3	G	3		*recognition*

	3	G	3	a	any type
	3	G	4		*other*
1	3	G	4	a	try and select those with prior language exposure
3	3	G	4	b	other
	3	G	4	c	hold people accountable
	3	H			**Ways to improve training**
	3	H	1		instructors need to have a teaching background or training - not just someone that is fluent
	3	H	3		allow language immersion as a tack-on to other training in host countries
2	3	H	4		SOF needs its own language school (to meet its needs better than DLI)
	3	H	6		Need mission-specific set of military terms/phrases for a language
	3	H	7		Include movies/books from other country to see how language is used
	3	H	8		Keep class size small (under 10)
1	3	H	9		other comments
	3	H	10		Make proficiency a requirement to be eligible to deploy
	3	H	11		Actually practice training sessions (they will be done down-range) in the native language stateside
	3	H	12		CA people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
	3	H	13		Psy Op people need separate training from rest of SF because of higher proficiency needs
	3	H	14		other comments
	3	H	15		Need to hire and retain only the best instructors
1	3	H	16		Imersion training is best

Appendix AI:

Biographical Information for Study Investigators

Adam W. Meade, Ph.D. (Principal Investigator)

Dr. Meade will be the principal investigator (PI) for this project. Dr. Meade has utilized content analysis for both private industry and in conjunction with academic research projects. Dr. Meade is a member of both the American Psychological Association (APA) and the American Psychological Society (APS). Specifically, Dr. Meade has used content analysis as a means to establish content validity when developing executive coaching materials, personality scales, and for marketing research.

Dr. Meade is currently an Assistant Professor of Industrial/Organizational Psychology at North Carolina State University and is a member of the American Psychological Society. At his previous job as Director of Research at TRACOM, a division of Reed Business Information, Dr. Meade developed several executive coaching assessments intended to measure a number of leadership behaviors (and personality scale, though in a different but similar project). He oversaw a process involving several subject matter experts (SMEs) in which they were asked to rate the relevance of each item written to each of the leadership dimensions. Quantitative analyses were then conducted to establish the content validity of the established measures.

He has also used qualitative analysis to develop and quantify summary categories for customer feedback surveys, product improvement comments, and narrative evaluations of employee performance as part of a large scale organizational succession planning project. Each of these projects entailed a process similar to the grounded theory approach in which numerous comments were loosely structured around a number of questions on diverse but related subjects. These comments were first read in order to identify the central themes relating to each question. After consulting with other project team members, these themes were revised in an iterative fashion until a set of categories were developed for each item. Then relying on SMEs, individual comments were categorized and then validated by a separate group of SMEs.

Dr. Meade has worked with military personnel and data as seen in the forthcoming publication in Military Psychology:

> Dierdorff, E. C., Surface, E. A., Meade, A. W., Thompson, L. F., & Martin, D. L. (in press). Group Differences and Measurement Equivalence: Implications for Command Climate Survey Research and Practice. *Military Psychology.*

Dr. Meade's Vita may be found online at: http://www4.ncsu.edu:8030/~awmeade/vita.htm.

S. Bartholomew Craig, Ph.D. (Technical Advisor)
A member of the American Psychological Association, Dr. Craig is an assistant professor in the industrial-organizational psychology program at North Carolina State University, an adjunct research scientist at Kaplan DeVries Inc., and a leadership development consultant. In addition to extensive use of qualitative data analysis in the individual assessment phase of his leadership development practice, Dr. Craig has used qualitative analysis in the course of program evaluation and basic research. Specifically, he has evaluated the effectiveness of leadership development interventions by content analyzing open-ended responses to survey and interview questions posed to leaders and their constituents following the intervention. One basic research project,

currently in progress, is examining corporate executives' responses to open-ended interview questions about ethical integrity in leadership. In addition to the qualitative analyses themselves, Dr. Craig's previous projects have included creation of summary reports of the findings and presentation of those reports in both written and oral formats. Previous work conducted for the U.S. Army includes program evaluation for the Army Medical Board and authoring a handbook chapter on leadership development for the Army Research Institute. A full curriculum vita and selected research papers are available at http://www.sbcraig.com.

Eric A. Surface, Ph.D. (Technical Advisor)

Dr. Surface will be serving as a technical advisor on this project because of his vast experience conducting research in the SOF community. Dr. Surface will not be involved in the actual analysis of the data or the interpretation of the results. Having developed the focus group protocols and conducted 80% of the groups for SOFLO under his ARI Consortium Research Fellow contract, his analysis might be potentially biased by this experience. He will provide an initial training session on the SOF context, SOF language requirements and training, and military/SOF jargon or terminology. He will also ask questions that may arise about these issues.

Dr. Surface is a principal and consultant with Surface, Ward & Associates, an organizational consulting and contract research firm located in Raleigh, NC. His areas of expertise include training, training evaluation and effectiveness research, job performance and proficiency measurement, organizational surveys, organizational development and effectiveness, and language proficiency and training. Dr. Surface has done extensive research and consulting with United States Special Operations Forces as well as work with corporations like IBM. He has authored a number articles, book reviews, and conference papers on topics ranging from language proficiency measurement to training performance. His most recent publication appears in the current issue of the *Foreign Language Annals* and assesses the interrater reliability of the ACTFL oral proficiency interview. Last year, he was a co-author of an article in *Personnel Psychology* that described command climate research at USASOC. Additionally, he has served as a reviewer for several conferences and journals. Dr. Surface is regarded as an expert in the areas of language proficiency measurement and language training and its effectiveness. He was recently asked to be a reviewer for *Modern Language Journal* in recognition of this expertise.

Some selected peer-reviewed publications and conference papers related to training, language, and SOF personnel are listed below:

Surface, E.A., & Dierdorff, E.C. (2003). Reliability and the ACTFL Oral Proficiency
     Interview: Reporting indices of interrater consistency and agreement for 19 languages. *Foreign Language Annals, 36* (4), 497-510.

Dierdorff, E.C., & Surface, E.A. (April, 2004). *Trainability and the prediction of training performance: Basic skills, cognitive ability, or both?* Accepted for presentation at the 19th annual meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL.

Surface, E.A., Dierdorff, E.C., & Donnelly, J. (April, 2004). *Modeling second language proficiency change for US Special Operations personnel.* Accepted for presentation at the 19th annual meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL.

Thompson, L.F., Surface, E.A., Martin, D.L., & Barrett, G.B. (April, 2004). *Promoting*

Favorable attitudes toward employee surveys: The role of follow-up. Accepted for presentation at the 19th annual meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL.

Thompson, L.F., Surface, E.A., Martin, D.L., & Sanders, M.G. (2003). From paper to pixels: Moving personnel surveys to the Web. *Personnel Psychology, 56* (1), 197-227.

Surface, E.A. (2000). [Review of the book Results: How to assess performance, learning, and perceptions in organizations]. *Personnel Psychology, 53,* 236-240.

Surface, E.A. (2003, April). *Investigating training performance in the Special Forces Qualifications Course*. Presentation presented in M.A. Wilson and M.G. Sanders' symposium [Project A Team: US Army Special Forces Assessment and Selection] at the 18th annual meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.

Dr. Surface has been working on research related to training, performance, and organizational issues in the SOF community since 1997 (mostly as an ARI research fellow). In 1999, LTG William Tangney recognized him as an honorary member of Army Special Operations Forces for his work on behalf of USASOC and its personnel. Eric was a member of the team that conducted the Special Forces Field Performance Project in 2000. He has been a frequent briefer at United States Army Special Operations Command (USASOC) on climate and organizational development issues, including co-briefing the USASOC workforce with LTG Doug Brown in 2001. He has worked on many projects at USASOC, including four command climate surveys, developing a competency model and 360-degree assessment instrument for supervisors, and conducting an award equity analysis. Additionally, he has conducted training research for JFKSWCS under the ARI MOA. Many of these projects included qualitative data analysis. He currently conducts training research for SOFLO through his ARI research fellow contract.

Additional Data Analysts

A number of additional data analysts were utilized to code and analyze the focus group transcripts under the guidance and supervision of Dr. Meade, in accordance with the approach and process outlined earlier. All additional analysts were graduate students in the Industrial/Organizational Psychology Ph.D. program at North Carolina State University (NCSU). All analysts have had graduate coursework in I.O. psychology and underwent extensive training prior to analyzing any focus group data. These analysts were:

Doctoral graduate students without Masters Degrees:
Anasuya Datta
Jennifer Lindberg
Christina Kroustalis
Reanna Poncheri
Becca Baker

Doctoral Students with Masters Degrees:
Kartik Bhavsar
Phillip Braddy
Kyle Huff
Kari Yoshimura
Jason Wilson

Appendix AJ:

About SWA

Surface, Ward & Associates (SWA) is an organizational consulting and contract research firm based in Raleigh, NC, and has been in business since 1997. SWA applies the principles, research, and methods of industrial/organizational psychology to assist organizations and their employees in enhancing their performance, solving work-related problems, and addressing workplace issues. SWA consults and conducts research in areas related to training and development, performance measurement and management, organization effectiveness and development, personnel selection, management and leadership, and human resources development and management. SWA is structured as a consulting and research network, allowing our core personnel to utilize numerous associates around the country with specialized expertise and world-class reputations as needed on a project-by-project basis. Our clients have included: Building Construction Products Division, Caterpillar, Inc; North Carolina Cooperative Education Association; seven divisions and the North American Staffing organization of IBM; American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL); and the United States Special Operations Command (USASOC).

Contact Information:

Dr. Eric A. Surface
Principal
Surface, Ward & Associates
PO Box 5704
Raleigh, NC 27650
919.821.7221
919.454.4824
esurface@bellsouth.net